REVIEW AND HERALD SUPPLEMENT.

VOL. 60. BATTLE CREEK, MICH., AUGUST 14, 1883. No. 33.

"SUFFER ME THAT I MAY SPEAK; AND AFTER THAT I HAVE SPOKEN, MOCK ON." Job 21:3.

"Suppression" and "The Shut Door."

BY ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.

I HAVE read the article written by Eld. A. C. Long on the subject of the "Early Writings of Mrs. White," and feel inclined to give it some notice. He speaks in a confident manner, which, with some, may be considered evidence of the correctness of his position. But I do not look upon it in that light. Having been acquainted with these subjects many years, I am not prepared to assent to statements on the mere ground of plausibility. In most respects, Eld. Long's professed argument lacks even plausibility.

At the very outset he makes an issue which has no foundation in fact, and draws his conclusions from certain assumptions, which, both assumptions and conclusions, are very far from the truth in the case. Thus in regard to an article in the REVIEW written by Bro. Butler, he says:—

"From the above quotations we gather the following points: 1. That these Early Writings of Mrs. White were published under her own eye, and with her approval; 2. That they contain all of her early visions; 3. That those who have claimed that certain portions of her visions were suppressed, are liars, since they are now all republished."

Except the first statement that the book, Experience and Views, was published with the approval of Sister White, the paragraph above quoted is an entire deception. It was never claimed by anybody that these publications "contain all her early visions." They who publish such an assertion know that there is not a word of truth in it. This very book lately republished speaks of a number of "early visions" which no printed publication ever contained. And her account of her early labors in "Spiritual Gifts" speaks of a large number of visions, some of which were given for her own instruction and encouragement; some for individuals or churches, which were written in part or in whole; and later, some were written and printed in slips or sheets for the benefit of those for whom they were given, or, if for general use at that time, the friends were so few that but few copies were required. These were not incorporated in "Experience and Views," which has always, and very properly, been considered her earliest publication. A number of them were barely referred to, or particular points may have been dwelt upon in relating her experience and labors, but they were not comprised in what were termed her "Early Writings."

It is not true that any part of her early visions or early writings have been "suppressed." Some of her early visions were printed in whole or in part, as before said, in slips or sheets; but the number printed was small. Those interested were few, and not many copies were needed. But no effort was ever made to withhold them from any readers, or to withdraw them from their possessors. They were scattered as far as readers could be found, or their numbers would go, and no effort was made to restrict their circulation. Where, then, was the *suppression?* The fact that a publication, or any part of it, is not *republished*, is no evidence of intention to suppress it, as long as no effort is made to recover or to check the circulation and use of the copies issued. All this talk about "all her early visions," and "suppression," is evidently to give plausibility to his professed reasoning, and his conclusion as to the object of neglecting to republish them or parts of them. But neither his reasoning nor his conclusion is in accordance with the truth in the matter.

His (or more properly their) statement of the belief of the early Seventh-day Adventists, is not truthful. It was made to show that they had an object in not republishing certain things, and that that object was to hide from the public the fact that the visions at first taught certain doctrines which are not now held by those who believe the visions. Now if we shall prove that that is not so, and that their statements to that effect are absolutely false, then there will remain no ground whatever for their accusations.

Eld. Long quotes from an address of a committee appointed to set forth the reasons why we should have Conferences and churches organized, as follows:—

"Our views of the work before us were mostly vague and indefinite, some still retaining the idea adopted by the body of Adventists in 1844, with Wm. Miller at their head, that our work for the world was finished, and that the message was confined to those of the original advent faith. So firmly was this believed, that one of our number was nearly refused the message, the individual presenting it having doubts of the possibility of his salvation because he was not in the '44 move."

Of this the editor of their paper says:—

"The people with whom she was connected, who afterward organized as Seventh-day Adventists, believed at that time that probation for sinners was past since 1844; and as Mrs. White always received ideas into her mind before she gave them out in vision, she believed this error too, and hence her language of the salvation of sinners being past, corresponded with her faith and that of her brethren. That this was the belief of the leaders of that people at that time, we have the statement in the REVIEW AND HERALD, Vol. 18, No. 3, June 11, 1861."

The above is a gross perversion of the words of that address. We are not astonished that the editor made such remarks; for it is not the first time of his trying to make that appear to be true which he had no reason to believe was true, and even that which he knew was not true. Lest some reader should think this charge too severe, I will state a case.

Several years ago a letter appeared in the *Advocate*, signed by a person living in San Francisco, which contained something which was not true. We called the attention of the writer to the case, and he informed us that he never wrote the letter as published. Upon further investigation the editor of the paper had to confess that he made changes in the letter; and thus he made it read, not as it was written, not according to the truth in the case, but as he wished it were, or as he wished it to appear. This we exposed in the spring of 1877. Being forced to make such a confession would have been sufficiently humiliating to make him careful how he perverted anybody's language thereafter, if the truth only were his object. But to take up and retail an evil report against their neighbor is the very life of that paper.

Now I assert with positiveness that such *was not* the belief of "the leaders," nor of any leading or ministerial brother of the Seventh-day Adventists. If any should draw such an inference from the quotation, he would have the inference dispelled if he read the entire address. Speaking of the necessity of organization to correct wrongs and disorders in the churches, and the difficulties which we had experienced in this respect, the address said:—

"And when order was to some extent introduced, and wrongs corrected or separated from in compliance with gospel rules, some imagined that the introduction of order *created* the evils brought to light, instead of exposing and correcting wrongs already existing."

There was no more reference to "the leaders" in the word "some" in the other paragraph than there was in this, and none at all in either. That language did not refer to any S. D. A. preacher, but to some who professed to be of us, and whom "the leaders" were at the very time trying to correct in regard to these things. At the time referred to in the address, the truth of the message was well formulated in the minds of the messengers. But because of limited ideas, not of the truth, but of *the great work* to be accomplished, many opposed organization, while others saw that it was the only means whereby we could keep our churches free from such fanaticism as was there referred to. As the work opened before us, and believers multiplied, the necessity of organization was felt more and more, and the language above quoted was used to impress this necessity upon the minds of all. To show that I have a right to be positive in my statement, I will now say that I wrote that address myself, and knew the person to whom reference was made as having expressed his doubts, and also that I was the one of whose salvation the doubt was expressed, because I had no part in the advent work of 1844. But not one of the leaders or ministers ever expressed any doubt on the subject; on the contrary, they hailed my conversion to the message with joy, and received me cordially. And further, I afterward learned that Bro. White was laboring with this man in order to correct his errors at the very time of my introduction to him. But without organization, we had no means of holding such persons in check. This man, with all his vagaries, represented the S. D. A. cause to us in Wisconsin for a time; but he was never recognized by "the leaders" as a preacher, nor indorsed as a teacher among them.

It is easy to show that the construction put upon the faith of the Seventh-day Adventists on the subject of "the shut door" is entirely wrong. That the great body of Adventists with Mr. Miller did, *for a short time after the disappointment of 1844*, believe that "the world" had received its last warning, is true beyond all doubt. They could hardly think otherwise with their faith on "the judgment message." But this idea was soon renounced, especially by two classes: one, composed of those who renounced the advent faith entirely, avowing their belief that the whole movement was fanatical and erroneous; the other, composed of a small company who saw that *another message* was to follow the judgment message of Rev. 14:6, 7, given in verses 9–12 of the same chapter, and represented also in Rev. 10:11, in which chapter (10) after the passing of the "time," the church was to "prophesy again before many peoples, nations, tongues, and kings." And it must be remembered that this vision in which it is claimed that she said the time for the salvation of sinners was (then) past, was given *more than five years after that time*, and when they had been laboring for years for all whom they could reach with the message.

But do not their writings of that time show that they believed in "the shut door?" We answer, In connection with *an open door*, Yes; in the sense in which their revilers use the phrase, No. The heading of that vision in which the (to them) objectionable expression is found is, "The Open and Shut Door." Mark it; they believed in an open door as well as a shut door. One paragraph in that vision is as follows:—

"I saw that Jesus had shut the door of the holy place, and no man can open it; and that he had opened the door into the most holy, and no man can shut it; Rev. 3: 7, 8; and that since Jesus has opened the door into the most holy place, which contains the ark, the commandments have been shining out to God's people, and they are being tested on the Sabbath question."

We find that in their writings of an early date they were careful to specify that they believed in "the open door;" and their labor for their fellowmen showed that they did believe a door was open where sinners might find the Saviour.

Of this I will now offer most conclusive proof, and show that their faith is either misunderstood or misrepresented by those who say they denied the salvation of sinners. No one was more outspoken in expressing his faith than Bro. Bates; no one more firmly believed in the shut door than he. I have before me the report of a meeting held in Vermont, signed Joseph Bates, dated Fairhaven, Nov. 4, 1850. In the last paragraph the report says:—

"The two Bro. Martins and their companions, with two others in Bennington, professed their clear convictions of the seventh-day Sabbath and shut door."

This, then, was noted as an article of their faith as late as 1850. But now notice further. In this same report he says: "Brother and Sister Butler came from Waterbury with Brn. Chamberlain and Churchill." And yet Bro. Churchill was not in the first message; his first advent experience was in the faith of the third angel's message, the Sab-

bath, and the shut door! It is also true that Bro. Churchill was held off for a time by some who were in doubt about his case, *but Sister White had a message of hope for him*, which silenced the objections of all who had confidence in the visions. Some were steeped in fanaticism, and rejected the visions, and of course they rejected him, but they were not the Seventh-day Adventists. Of course many embraced the Sabbath who were believers in that view, but the visions were the means of bringing them out to the faith of *an open door* as well as the shut door.

And again, in the sketch of Sister White's life and labors, we find an account of a meeting which she attended in Carver, Mass., in 1846. Here were two men convicted on the Sabbath question, who were not in the first message; for these also she had a comforting message of hope. These cases prove positively that she did not believe "the door of mercy" was shut against those who were not in the '44 movement.

And still further. I have before me a statement written by Marion C. Truesdail (formerly Stowell), and signed by herself and five others, from which I copy the following words:—

"During Miss Harmon's [now Mrs. White] visit to Paris, Me., in the summer of 1845, I stated to her the particulars of a dear friend of mine, whose father had prevented her attending our meetings; consequently, she had not rejected light. She smilingly replied, 'God never has shown me that there is no salvation for such persons. It is those only who have had the light of truth presented to them, and knowingly rejected it.' Miss Harmon's reply coincided with my idea of a shut door, and in justice no other could be derived from it. It might be well for those who have so much fault to find to read the decisive answer given by Jesus against those 'that were bidden to come,' that refused. Luke 14:24."

(Letter from Mrs. Truesdail Aug 17, 1870)

The writer of the above, and they who signed her statement with her, lived in Paris, Me., in 1844, and for about ten years thereafter, and she was intimately acquainted with Sister White and her early labors; and I am able to say that Bro. and Sister White were far in advance of the body of Seventh-day Adventists in regard to the nature and magnitude of our work, and the necessity of a perfect organization to carry the message *to the world*. I heard him introduce the idea of an organization at least five years before he could induce his brethren to take any step in that direction. Almost all Adventists, of all classes, were opposed to organization. Many of the S. D. Adventists were in doubt whether the "third angel's message" would be given to any great extent outside of the United States. Even at the time when we organized, we had not the remotest idea that we should carry on such a systematic missionary work as we are carrying on at present, which is but a prelude to the work which is soon to follow. In this respect—and this relates to "our views of the work"—our views were indefinite. Why was it, then, that Bro. White had ideas of the work and its necessities so far in advance of those of his brethren. It was because he was so closely connected with *the Testimonies*, which were leading the workers, step by step, to larger views of our work; which had pointed out the necessity of thoroughly organized efforts to give the last message of warning to a perishing world. But the matter was delayed for years, until the body of the brethren also could see the necessity, and thus united action be insured. It is an evident truth that the vision which speaks of "their salvation," given in 1849, is misapplied and perverted by our opposers.

I will now examine more particularly the *supposed object* of not republishing certain visions or parts of visions. They say "omitted or suppressed." But these words do not signify the same thing. I have sufficiently noticed that there has been no suppression. It is easy to find a reason why many of her visions were not published. We believe it is left to the judgment of Sister White herself whether the circumstances and the nature of a vision demands its publication, where no specific direction or impression is given with it. Jeremiah put on record the words which he wrote to Jehoiakim; but the king burned the roll, and the prophet renewed the message to him, and "added besides unto them many like words." But he did not put them in the book of his prophecy. Perhaps some of the princes who rejected the message turned round and accused him of "suppressing" part of the Lord's testimony; but probably Jeremiah met the mind of the Lord in the matter. Paul said he had not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God to the brethren at Ephesus; but when he wrote to them, he wrote but a small part of the counsel of God. Was his failure to write it all to them, or to publish all the wonderful things which he received by "visions and revelations," evidence that he intended to "suppress" a part of that which the Lord revealed to him?

Why certain parts of the vision published in the tract, "A Word to the Little Flock," were omitted. I am not able to say. I can see no object in their being omitted. And he who had sole charge of the publishing work for "the little flock" at that time is not living, so that if any reason existed, it will never be known. It is always right and just to inquire into a person's motives for an action before we condemn him; if no reason can be given, or no motive proved, showing that there was a wrong intention in the action, that fact will go very far toward exonorating him from having any wrong motive. If anybody could show that there was any wrong intention, any evil motive, in omitting these lines, we would readily unite with those who condemned the action. We regret that it was done; but we see no possible reason for imputing wrong intention to the one who did it. Certainly Eld. Long has not given the true reason, and this I am able to show.

That Eld. Long has supposed an impossible object, and that he knew that his statement was unjust when he made it, I believe every candid person will admit when his professed reasoning is examined. The following is the principal omission, consisting of twenty-two lines:—

"And as we were gazing at the glories of the place, our eyes were attracted upward to something that had the appearance of silver. I asked Jesus to let me see what was within. In a moment we were winging our way upward, and entering in. Here we saw good old father Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Noah, Daniel, and many like them. And I saw a vail with a heavy fringe of silver and gold as a border on the bottom; it was very beautiful. I asked Jesus what was within the vail. He raised it with his own right arm, and bade me take heed. I saw there a glorious ark, overlaid with pure gold, and it had a glorious border, resembling Jesus' crowns; on it were two bright angels, whose wings were spread over the ark as they sat on each end, with their faces turned toward each other and looking downward. In the ark, beneath where the angels' wings were spread, was a golden pot of manna, of a yellowish cast; and I saw a rod, which Jesus said was Aaron's; I saw it bud, blossom, and bear fruit. And I saw two long golden rods, on which hung silver wires, and on the wires most glorious grapes; one cluster was more than a man here could carry. And I saw Jesus step up and take of the manna, almonds, grapes, and pomegranates, and bear them down to the city, and place them on the supper table. I stepped up to see how much was taken away, and there was just as much left; and we shouted Alleluia, Amen. We all descended from this place down to the city."

Now notice Eld. Long's conclusion, or the reason he assigns for this omission. He says:—

"We are again left to conjecture why these lines are omitted. It appears evident to my mind that at this early period she believed in the immortality of the human soul, and that the saints went to heaven at death, for she says that she saw Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Noah, Daniel, and many like them, in the heavenly Jerusalem above. As these had no resurrection, they must have ascended there at death. As she does not now believe in that doctrine, this portion of her vision had to be suppressed. That weak and childish expression of glorious grapes growing on silver wires, and these wires attached to golden rods, was doubtless sufficient to have it struck out also."

This comment has not even the feeble claim of plausibility; more, it has not the merit of common honesty. If we cannot show that it is an inexcusable deception, we are willing to stand impeached.

1. The vision said nothing about grapes *growing* on silver wires. It describes what she saw within the vail of the sanctuary. She said she saw long golden rods on which hung, not grew, silver wires, and on the wires, glorious grapes. We here say that we have seen clusters of grapes hung on wires and hempen cords, and these again hung on rods of oak, in California. But Eld. Long must not tell that we have said that grapes grow on wires, and cords, and oak sticks in California, though he might with as much justice as he made the above declaration.

2. He says the scene of this vision is laid before the resurrection. This he says in order to make it appear that she believed in the immortality of the soul when the vision was given, and a change of faith made it necessary to "suppress" the vision. We have the testimony of those who were intimately acquainted with her at that time that she did not believe in the immortality of the soul. But such evidence is not necessary. The vision itself most clearly condemns the reason given by Eld. Long, and not only this, but it condemns Eld. Long in giving the reason. In the vision the resurrection precedes the lines omitted, upon which he makes that comment. In the third paragraph preceding the lines under consideration are found these words:—

"Then Jesus' silver trumpet sounded, as he descended on the cloud, wrapped in flames of fire. He gazed on the graves of the sleeping saints, then raised his eyes and hands to heaven, and cried, Awake! Awake! Awake! ye that sleep in the dust, and arise! Then there was a mighty earthquake. The graves opened, and the dead came up, clothed with immortality. The 144,000 shouted, Alleluia! as they recognized their friends who had been torn from them by death, and in the same moment we were changed, and caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air."

Then follows their entrance into the city, and the omitted lines are a part of the description of things seen in the city. Any candid person who will read them in their connection must agree with us that there is no reason apparent for their omission; certainly no ill intention appears in their omission, for they teach nothing inconsistent with the rest of the vision, nor with the Scriptures. There is nothing in them to which an opponent can object, unless they are misrepresented, as Eld. Long misrepresents them.

To make this yet more apparent, we will specify in their order some of the things which the vision contains:—

a. The 144,000 were gathered out of the world, and sealed, and clothed with the glory of God.

b. They saw the sign of the Son of man, the cloud of glory on which the coming Saviour was seated.

c. The voice of Jesus raised the dead, as noticed in the quotation given above.

d. They all entered the cloud and ascended to the New Jerusalem.

e. The 144,000 stood apart from the others on the sea of glass.

f. She saw the ancient worthies,—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc.

g. Jesus took of the fruits of the place and put them on the supper table.

h. They left the city and descended to the earth, and the mountain became a great plain under the feet of Jesus.

i. The city came down from heaven upon the earth.

Now what shall we think of Eld. Long's statement that "these had no resurrection" at the time she saw them in the vision? He affirms that she thought they were there in December, 1844, when the vision was given! To make that appear consistent, he must affirm that she thought that in December, 1844, the 144,000 were gathered out and sealed; that Jesus had come on the white cloud; that his voice had raised the dead; that the living saints were changed; that they were together caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord; that they had ascended to the city; that they had seen the marriage supper prepared; that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., *with the resurrected saints*, were then in the city; and finally, that the New Jerusalem had descended from heaven to the earth! Did Eld. Long think that she believed all this had taken place when she had the vision?—No; he knew when he wrote that she did not believe that *any* of it had taken place when she had the vision. Why, then, did he declare that she saw Abraham and other ancient saints in heaven before the resurrection, when the vision says it was after the resurrection? I can imagine only one answer that can be given to this question, namely, *because it suited his purpose.*

Eld. Long is very sarcastic on Eld. Butler because of his incautious expression; but to make the worst that is possible of Eld. Butler's expression, it still must pass for an honest mistake. No one can with reason say that Eld. Butler did not believe all that he intended to say in his article. But can the same be said for Eld. Long? The vision itself did not leave the resurrection in any doubt as to the fact or the chronology. It gave it ample prominence, and placed it before she saw the saints in the city. Had Eld. Long read the connection, so that he could understand it? In his tract, pp. 5, 6, he says:—

"I read down through seventy-two lines more, and find that the new book is a correct reprint of it so far. But here at the end of the seventy-second line there is another chasm, omission, or suppression of twenty-two lines."

Thus it appears that he had *carefully read* the paragraph relating to the scene of the resurrection, and yet deliberately denied that there had been a resurrection when she saw the saints in heaven. The idea that *she believed* the ancient saints were in heaven in 1844 cannot possibly be gathered from the vision, but exactly the opposite. That idea could only originate in the mind of a person who was determined to oppose the visions, even though he had to *manufacture reasons* for his opposition, no matter how contrary to the words of the vision he made them appear, nor how plainly his statements concerning them were disproved by them.

I must further notice as briefly as possible the expression, "The time for their salvation is past." And (1) I have sufficiently proved that the idea of "the shut door" believed in by Sister White, in connection with "an open door," is not that claimed by her opposers; that she did not believe that the "door of mercy" was closed in 1844 against those who were not in the advent movement. Her teachings and her labors in 1849, when this vision was given, are a standing disproof of their assertion. (2) As in the case of the passage which I have quite fully examined, the chronology of which Eld. Long so inexcusably misrepresented, so in this, our opposers are greatly at fault in its application. That language was used in March, 1849, in a vision of the nature and future work of spiritualism. That work was then in its infancy, not at all popular, and few could have imagined that it would spread over all the world, and become the most popular theory of the age. In that vision she said:—

"I saw that the mysterious knocking in New York and other places, was the power of Satan, and that such things would be more and more common, clothed in a religious garb, so as to lull the deceived to more security." "I saw that Satan was working through agents in a number of ways. He was at work through ministers who have rejected the truth, and are given over to strong delusions to believe a lie, that they might be damned. When they were preaching or praying, some would fall prostrate or helpless, not by the power of the Holy Ghost, but by the power of Satan breathed upon these agents, and through them to the people. While preaching, praying, or conversing, some professed Adventists who had rejected present truth used mesmerism to gain adherents, and the people would rejoice in this influence, for they thought it was the Holy Ghost." "Some of these agents of Satan were affecting the bodies of some of the saints,—those whom they could not deceive and draw away by a Satanic influence. Oh, that all could get a view of it as God revealed it to me, that they might know more of the wiles of Satan, and be on their guard!" "I saw that the mysterious signs, and wonders, and false reformations, would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past."

In connection with this, read what was given in the following year, 1850:—

"I saw that soon it would be considered blasphemy to speak against the rapping, and that it would spread more and more; that Satan's power would increase, and some of his devoted followers would have power to work miracles, and even to bring down fire from heaven in the sight of men."

Now every one knows that *very little of this is yet fulfilled.* It has but just commenced to take its place as a religion. It is not considered blasphemy to speak against its power and miracles. But the way is well prepared for this to be fulfilled speedily. It is even now taking the garb of religion in order to deceive, but religious reformations under spiritualism have never yet been seen. They will be seen in connection with the closing scenes of this dispensation. Mark the connection in the vision,—"mysterious signs, and wonders, and false reformations," "not reformations from error to truth." It is to *these reformations*, carried on under the influence of the power of Satan as manifested in the signs and wonders of spiritualism, that the vision has reference, and not to reformations which took place years ago. I believe that the remarks of Eld. Smith in "Objections Considered" are just and true as far as they go, but they do not reach the full intent of this important vision, which I verily believe to be from Heaven, given for the "edification and comfort" of the little flock, and which we shall soon see literally and completely fulfilled.

Some years ago a writer in Marion, Iowa, objected to our faith on the two-horned beast, on the ground that, if we were right, spiritualism would have much to do in making the image, whereas this would be a religious movement, and spiritualism was altogether irreligious, and opposed to religion. But we *believed* it would change its position in that respect, and it is now fulfilling the prediction. A change has for some time been going on, and the following shows how far it has progressed.

The city authorities of San Francisco determined to make the mediums and clairvoyants in the city pay license fees, and they have resisted. In a recent trial of a clairvoyant the case turned on another point, so that the real question did not come to an issue; but the *Chronicle's* report says:—

"Had not the case gone off on another point, the defense would have offered testimony showing that the spiritualistic fraternity and sisterhood are organized in *a religious incorporation*, which provides for the *ordaining of mediums*, who, it would have been claimed, hold in the spiritualistic faith and religion the same position as do priests and clergymen in other religious denominations. It had been intended to show also that the accused was such an ordained medium, and that clairvoyancy was the greatest gift bestowed on mediums. It was to have been argued on this showing that until clergymen and priests were compelled to pay licenses, none could or should be collected from spiritualistic priestesses."

This will yet come to a decision in the courts, and it is easy to see that it must soon turn in favor of spiritualism as a legally incorporated religion, with its regularly ordained mediums. With its millions of believers it must be popular as a religion; and there are a host of ministers, among them some of the most eminent in the land, who now occupy a position which would not only permit, but directly lead them to act as *priests of the spiritualist church!* Who, except one under the direction of the Spirit of God, would have predicted all this of spiritualism when it commenced in Western New York?

In the light of all this, the remarks of Eld. Long on page 5 of his little tract appear ridiculous. Concerning the opinion that the time for the salvation of sinners closed in 1844, he says:—

"Mrs. White believed this doctrine, and taught it in her visions; but since that time she has renounced that doctrine, and consequently those portions of her visions that taught it are now suppressed and denied."

But we have proved that she did not believe it nor teach it in her visions; and the paragraph on which they principally depend for proof against her on this point, stands, as it always has stood, in "Experience and Views," and was recently republished in Battle Creek, Mich., and Oakland, Cal. What are Eld. Long's statements worth, in the light of these facts?

We fully believe that "the present truth," the true advent message, is now, and has been for years, *testing the world.* While we do not believe that they who keep Sunday now receive "the mark of the beast" in fulfillment of Rev. 13, we do believe that the great majority of those who have heard this truth and seen the light, by willfully rejecting it have taken a position to effectually shut themselves out of the kingdom; that they are in the sight of God where they are placed in the parable of the invitation to the supper made for the marriage of the king's son—*they are rejected.* Because they refused the message, it was said of them, "Not one of them shall taste of my supper." *But others are still being called.* So it was in the parable; so it is now. The view she had of "the travels of the Advent people to the holy city," in the narrow path above the world, is fulfilled only in small part. Many below that path have refused the message which the Lord in mercy sent to them, and are rejected. Before the message closes, *most of the world* will occupy that position; and *all the world*, except those on the narrow path, will be rejected before Christ comes, for every case will be decided before the advent. The vision embraces the whole journey, even to the coming of the Saviour.

The fault of our opposers on all these visions is in claiming a complete fulfillment of them years ago, while no reasonable construction will admit of their being applied to the past, except in a small part. In the longest omission we have clearly shown that Eld. Long did, in a most inexcusable manner, misrepresent the vision by laying the scene of its fulfillment before the resurrection, when *the vision says* it was after the resurrection. Eld. Long could be more successful in charging that John believed in the immortality of the soul, because he saw the saints in glory in A. D. 96!

In regard to "the number of the beast," the objection is sufficiently answered in the book by Bro. Smith. I will not take upon myself to affirm that it is *fully* understood. As Bro. Smith intimates, there would be no incongruity in giving a number to both the beast and his image; on the contrary, there would seem to be a fitness in it. And he prudently says: "Doubtless more light will be given on this point as we approach the time of its fulfillment." I say "prudently," for the Lord has specially pointed to this subject as one requiring much wisdom. Dr. Clarke treated it as a point to be most easily and certainly established; more so than any other in the book. But the Lord said: "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast." *It may be* that it is now understood, and that the numerical value of the letters of the pope's title give the correct solution. Dr. Clarke finds the same number in the alphabetical value of the letters in "the Latin kingdom," in Greek. This he considered "a demonstration." It may be a mere coincidence. We feel the utmost confidence in the correctness of the vision, and we believe that time will vindicate it.

And we believe that all her exhortations and statements in regard to the shortness of time are worthy of all acceptation. Peter exhorts the servants of the Lord to "hasten the coming of the day of God." To the careless reader his language may appear strange; it evidently appeared obscure to the English translators, and therefore they made it actually obscure by a needless and erroneous addition. God has a specified work for this message to do. If the Advent people, numbering between 50,000 and 100,000 in 1844, had been true to their trust, and to the profession of their faith, and received the third angel's message just as it stands in the prophecy, immediately following the judgment-hour message which they had given, the world would have been warned in a very short time, and the "nations, and people, and tongues" of the earth would have been moved as with a mighty whirlwind. The work of the message would have been done in a short time. *Time should have closed years ago*, and would, if the body of Adventists in 1844 had stood true to their trust. A full understanding and appreciation of this text in 2 Peter 3 must cause every heart to feel sad over the backslidings of God's people, to whom he committed the light. We are not surprised that God has spoken to them in visions, and warned them faithfully. And when people set themselves against the Heaven-given message of Rev. 14: 9–12, and the Testimonies of the Holy Spirit, we are not surprised that they find, greatly to their own satisfaction, a few *apparent* contradictions in the Testimonies. Infidels are using the Bible just so, *and with equal success.* And I believe the result will be the same to the two classes.

"Early Writings" and "Suppression."

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

LAST fall a volume entitled the "Early Writings of Mrs. E. G. White" was issued from the press, and a large number of copies have been sold. It was a book much desired by our people; for it contained nearly all of her earliest published writings, many of which had been out of print for more than twenty years. In noticing this book in the REVIEW of Dec. 26, 1882, the writer, among other statements, made the following concerning "Experience and Views," and "Supplement to Experience and Views," which formed an important part of this volume:—

"These were the very first of the published writings of Sister White. Since they went out of print, many thousands have become interested in her writings. Many of these have greatly desired to have in their possession *all* she has written for publication. Efforts in all directions have been made to hunt up the little volume in question, and worn copies here and there have been obtained, and held with great care. So strong was the interest to have these early writings reproduced, that several years ago the General Conference recommended by vote that they be republished. The volume under consideration is the result of this interest. It meets a want long felt."

I give this somewhat lengthy extract because a few of our people have become somewhat confused over a slight inaccuracy in it, as a little company at Marion, Ia., who have been for seventeen years past our bitterest enemies, have issued a

little tract written by A. C. Long, and have scattered it widely throughout the country among our people, in which, by a process of reasoning peculiar to that class, they have tried to make it appear that somebody has been very wicked, and that Sister White's visions have been "*suppressed.*"

There is but one inaccuracy in that article, and that is found in this clause: "These were the very first of the published writings of Sister White." This statement is not strictly true, though we supposed it was at the time we wrote it. We had never seen any earlier published writings of hers, and others of long experience thought the same as we did. But since writing to Bro. Andrews, and talking with others longer in the truth, we have found that we were mistaken. We have never claimed to be infallible, and often find, like other mortals, that we make mistakes, and hope ever to be willing to acknowledge them when we know them to be such. But we want the reader distinctly to notice that we *did not* claim that Early Writings contained "all her early visions," as Mr. Long tries to make us say. This we have never said. We did suppose, however, at the time, that "Experience and Views," and the "Supplement" to the same, contained her earliest "published writings," but were mistaken. There is quite a difference between this and what Mr. Long undertakes to make me say, that the book in question contains "all her early writings." I stated in that article that many of our people "desired to have in their possession *all* she had written," and that this republication of "Experience and Views" and "Supplement" was undertaken because of this desire, but did not say this comprehended all she had written in the early part of this work, or that they were "all now republished," as he says. He picks out a sentence here and there from my article, and groups them together, and tries to make it appear that I said this, and then tries to prove that I am a liar in doing so. He tries to put me in a position I never took, and then proceeds to demolish it. This is a favorite style of argument with this class; but it amounts to nothing, only to show the character of the men who use it.

We will now briefly explain the manner of publishing some of the earlier visions of Mrs. White, as we have been able to ascertain the facts from Bro. Andrews and some others early in the faith. Her first vision, given in 1844, was first published in the *Day Star* (a first-day Adventist paper) in 1846, and then in the tract "Word to the Little Flock," by Eld. White, in 1847. Another vision, given in Topsham, Me., in 1847, was written by her to Eld. Joseph Bates, who had it published in this same tract, as we have stated in the article headed, "A Venerable Document." We are told by brethren who have long been in the truth, that from time to time "Views" were published in sheets for the benefit of those who desired to obtain them. Whether or not these are all obtainable now, we cannot tell. At the time, they were read with much interest by the early believers, who considered them a great source of comfort. In this tract, page 21, Bro. Bates makes this remark: "It is now about two years since I first saw the author, and heard her relate the substance of her visions as she has since published them in Portland (April 6, 1846)." This shows there were some of them published very early. These were read by the believers, and no doubt kept as something valuable by a few of the most careful. But nearly forty years have passed, and great changes have occurred, and no one can say that "all these early writings" can be found.

In 1851 the little work, "Experience and Views," was published, and in 1853, the Supplement to it. In this first work, her first vision, as published in "Word for the Little Flock," is nearly all repeated. The same is true of the one given at Topsham, Me., in 1847. There are a few passages, not specially important, left out. The same is also true, I think, of one or two other visions published by themselves, and largely republished in "Experience and Views" or "Supplement." There is no claim whatever in either of these little works that all her views were contained in them which had been previously published in "Word to the Little Flock" or elsewhere.

In a very few years after these works were published, they went out of print; that is, the edition was all sold out. Back before 1860, when I had become interested in these questions, I could not obtain a copy till I accidentally found one in a chamber among some old books. I have kept it and prized it highly ever since. Many others wished to obtain them, but could not find them.

The number of Sabbath-keepers was rapidly increasing; and other and larger works were written by Sister White; such as the "Great Controversy," "Facts of Faith," her life and experience, called "Vol. 2, Spiritual Gifts," the small volumes of the "Testimonies to the Church," now 31 in number, and also volumes of the "Spirit of Prophecy." These first mentioned contained some of her earlier visions condensed, the most important passages being retained, and others not republished. We make these brief statements of facts for the benefit of those who have embraced the truth at a comparatively recent date; our older brethren know them to be true as well as the writer.

The first we ever heard of this howl of "suppression" was back in 1866, when Snook and Brinkerhoff got out a little pamphlet against the visions, full of gall and bitterness. This was followed in 1870 by another slippery document from the pen of H. E. Carver. Our people and the visions have survived both of these attacks, and still prosper. And now comes Mr. Long's poor imitation of both of these men; and after examining the three together, we cannot see that he has a single new idea which they did not have. But having obtained two very zealous recruits in the persons of "Prof. McLearn," and Mr. Green, "the eminent lawyer,' as they call him, we hear a great noise about "suppression" once more. The sound is very familiar to those of us who have lived in Iowa. When Mr. Long's tract appeared last spring, we did not see anything in it worth noticing; but on attending the Western camp-meetings, we find that great efforts have been made to circulate it in almost every church, and a few brethren, comparatively young in the faith, have been troubled on some of these points. We make these statements for their benefit.

And right here we will state a few facts to show the candor(?) of these Marion Ia., people concerning this "suppression" cry. In Snook and Brinkerhoff's work, published in 1866, and in Carver's, published in 1870, which were circulated as leading works by this party, a great deal of effort was made to show that our people were deceptive, and that we were unwilling to have the people know what the visions taught, and therefore suppressed "Experience and Views," because of what it said on the "shut-door" question. In the first of these works, after quoting from "Experience and Views," on page 6 this language occurs: "Why is all this suppressed? and why does it not appear in any work now for sale at their office?" And on the same page another statement of similar import is made. In Carver's book, on page 60, similar statements are made. It is well known that this has been one of their main points with which to throw doubt on the visions, that we did not republish "Experience and Views;" "we had become ashamed of it;" "we dare not publish it," etc, etc.

But after a while, when the demand of our people for it became strong enough, a large edition was published, and Mr. Long himself admits that it was published entire as printed in 1851 and 1853. Our people were strongly urged to buy it, and many thousands of copies have been sold. This is the way we showed we were ashamed of it. It has been read with deep interest, and we have never heard of a single person who lost any faith in the visions because of reading it.

But now comes out this last tract of Long's on "suppression," published at first in the *Advocate*, the organ of this Marion party. Is there one word of admission or confession that they were incorrect in their charges concerning the "*suppression*" of "Experience and Views?"—Not a word. They are not candid enough to admit it. And yet the republication and circulation of that work by us proves beyond all controversy that their charges of our suppression of it, because we feared to let the people know what it said about the "shut door," were utterly false.

Again, we have just republished all the visions of Sister White contained in the "Word to the Little Flock," as stated in the article entitled "A Venerable Document." It can now be obtained at the REVIEW Office, singly or by the quantity. It appears just as originally published, with a very few grammatical corrections. All that want this little tract can now get it. Mr. Long has laboriously tried to show some great wickedness on our part, because a few passages in it were not placed in "Experience and Views," when published in 1851. We have, he says, "*suppressed* fifty-nine lines" of Mrs. White's writings. But here are these visions about which they have raised such a howl for nearly twenty years past, published entire as in "Word to the Little Flock," and all who want to obtain them are invited to send for them freely, and see what terrible things they contain. And now, after all of these charges, which events have shown to be false, will they make any admission that they were wrong, and that their charges were unjust? We have no expectation of it. They have never in the past been known to be candid enough to do such a thing.

Another circumstance will perhaps bring out this point in a clear light. About ten years ago, soon after the iniquity of the notorious Nathan Fuller had become known to us, and he had been published through our paper, and had been kicked out of our denomination, he turned up in Marion, Ia., and was received there as a great acquisition, and made much of, as most any one is who has once been a Seventh-day Adventist, if he will talk against the visions. When I learned of this, knowing what sort of a person he was, I wrote an article for the REVIEW, telling some of the awful facts concerning him. H. E. Carver, the editor of the *Advocate*, their church organ, devoted several columns to my special benefit, in which he denounced me in the most terrible terms, and said I was "worse than a murderer" or a thief, and accused me of "bearing false witness," etc., etc. But after some time they found the said Fuller to be a heavier load than they could carry. Quite a number of their more respectable members were very much dissatisfied, and the present editor of the *Advocate* left their office, and went to work in another office, and they found they were getting into serious trouble among themselves over his case; so their church appointed a committee to ask of me facts with which to try Fuller. Of course I gave them the desired facts, and they soon got rid of him. But from that day to this I have never known of a single sentence in the *Advocate* making any apology for their false and cruel charges against me; and years after, when I saw Mr. Carver in Marion, and asked him if he did not believe my statements concerning Fuller were all true, he admitted that he did, and that he owed me an apology. I told him then and there that justice required a confession through their paper just as broad as those charges had been made; but I have never known of a sentence of the kind being published. How can we expect any Christian candor from those who pursue such a course?

Perhaps there never was a more unjust charge made than this, that we have "suppressed" the visions, because there were some portions of them of which we were ashamed. Mr. Long thinks he has found "fifty-nine lines" which we have "suppressed." From a rough estimate, we judge there are at least 150,000 lines extant of her different published works. Surely, according to his own statement, it is but a very small proportion of her writings we were ashamed of,—fifty-nine lines out of 150,000. But now nearly all of these fifty-nine lines are published, and accessible, and all who want them are invited to obtain them. And if there are any of the works he speaks of, as the one entitled "The Sealing," which we have not published, it is solely because we do not possess a copy to print from. If he will send it to us, we will publish that if it is genuine. What becomes, then, at last, of this wonderful cry of "suppression," about which these people have been making so much fuss for nearly twenty years? It has dwindled down to a point too small to be seen with the naked eye. It was always utterly false, and now the facts have demonstrated it too clearly to be misunderstood. We say again, as we said in the article published last December, "These lying insinuations have an-

swered their purpose in deceiving some unwary souls. They now appear in their real character" by the publication of the very passages they claim we "suppressed." There is nothing in any of these passages which he quotes that we should have any desire to conceal, or that is difficult to explain. In many of her published writings which are obtainable at any time, there are passages far more difficult; yet they are published by the thousand copies.

These men complain, on the one hand, that we make the visions too prominent, exalt them too highly, think too much of them, and test every one by them (which is false); and then, on the other hand, claim that we "suppress" them, are ashamed of them, and will not keep them where they can be obtained, etc., etc. Surely they are very hard to please. Their main stock in trade is to find fault, and to accuse the brethren, showing themselves to be in close sympathy with him who is called the "Accuser of the brethren."

We are free to admit that during the history of this cause there have been instances, more or less numerous, where omissions have been made in republishing some of Mrs. White's visions, but never from such motives as have been attributed to us; for there were none of these omitted passages which contained a single sentiment we were ashamed of, or that taught a doctrine which was contrary to our belief as a people, or a sentiment that was immoral. But in those visions which had been published it was thought some passages were personal, or related to matters which at the time of their publication were important, but had now become unimportant because of an entire change of circumstances, or for some similar reason. Hence it was not thought these were of sufficient importance to demand their republication, and some omissions were made.

If any one will take the trouble to examine Vol. 4 of "Spiritual Gifts," he will find a synopsis of the "Testimonies to the Church," arranged in this way, with a large number of personal testimonies left out, and various passages omitted. These were published under the eye of Bro. White himself; but it would be perfectly foolish to charge him with a design to "suppress" any portion of the Testimonies, because of these omissions, when there were thousands of copies of them in the hands of our people, and many still for sale at the Office. Yet one would have just as much right to make such a claim as our opponents have to put forth the one they have been making so persistently for many years past. There were many reasons which Bro. White could and did assign why it was not necessary that all these personal testimonies should be republished after many of the persons involved were dead, or had changed their course, and had repented of their sins. These reasons had weight; yet we all know Bro. White stood up as staunchly for the Testimonies as any of us. But others thought (and the writer was one who felt very strenuous on this point) that it would be far better to have them all accessible just as originally published; and all the volumes of the "Testimonies to the Church" are now being republished. What a cry of suppression we should have had, if some of these volumes could not be obtained! We want them all, because we believe they contain precious light from the Lord, and every one of them contains most profitable instruction. We trust there will never be occasion to say more concerning this foolish and wicked charge of "suppression."

A Venerable Document.

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

I HAVE before me a tract of 24 pages, entitled, "A Word to the Little Flock," dated Brunswick, Maine, May 30, 1847, and published by James White. Until recently I did not know such a tract was in existence. Over thirty-six years ago, in the very rise of this message, when there were probably not one hundred Seventh-day Adventists in the world, this document was issued. What changes have occurred in our history since that time! And how interesting to look back to that point when the pioneers in this work first began to get an insight into the glorious and harmonious system of truth which is now becoming a power in the world, and is going to the remotest parts of the earth! How little could they then realize the extent of the work that was before them!

At that point those Adventists who had commenced to observe the seventh day were just emerging from the despondency arising from the passing of the time in 1844. They had begun to see the connection between the messages given before, and the work to be accomplished by the third angel's message. Light was shining upon the sanctuary subject, one point after another was being developed, and they were beginning to feel that they now had a work to do for their fellow-men. They were rejoicing, as light began to flow in upon them. What intense interest they then felt in these great truths! How earnestly they besought light of God! And their prayers were answered. The foundations of the structure of truth which now seem so solid and plain, were wisely laid by our pioneers, and we have not had to go back and change this and that position to suit the times, as many others have had to do. The changes we have had to make were simply an advancing march, as additional light and truth broke in, till the whole system of the truths we now hold was brought out.

What an interesting history it would be, if we could have a truthful record of all those struggles, those peculiar experiences, and those spiritual conflicts, and sacrifices, and victories, through which those faithful pioneers passed! It would make a volume of thrilling interest for those of us who have embraced the truth later. As they are dropping, one by one, from feebleness, and over-labor, and exposure, under their burden of care and toil, we have often felt how precious it would be if we could have a full account of their struggles and experiences. It would be excellent reading for our children and the rising generation, and for those now embracing the truth.

But to return to the tract which has brought these thoughts vividly to our minds. It seems to contain the writings of three persons,—Eld. James White, Sister Ellen G. White, and Father Joseph Bates. It will be of interest to notice the subjects contained in it. After a brief introduction from the pen of Bro. White, we have an article on the "Seven Last Plagues," largely composed of quotations of Scripture sustaining the positions we now hold. The next article is entitled, "The Voice of God;" then we have "The Time of Trouble," "The Time of Jacob's Trouble," and "Thoughts on Revelation 14," evidently from the pen of Bro. White, proving substantially the positions on these subjects we now hold. There is also a letter from Sister White to Eli Curtis relative to the cleansing of the sanctuary, the two resurrections, the holy city, etc., etc., taking the positions now held by us; and some further remarks by Bro. White. Then follow two remarkably interesting visions of Sister White's, the first entitled, "To the Remnant Scattered Abroad," which Bro. White states was published in the *Day Star* in 1846, and another which she had in Topsham, Me., in 1847, which she wrote out and sent to Father Bates. And following this, some remarks of his stating how he became a believer in the visions, and two articles from Bro. White on "The Temple of God" and "The Judgment." These comprise all the contents of the tract.

These articles are of deep interest, inasmuch as they show how the pioneers in this movement were bringing out at that time many of the most important truths of the message. They were bringing out to the despised and disappointed advent believers the light which would enable them to understand their position, and discern the work which lay before them. God was evidently directing their minds. Those pillars of truth stand firm to-day. The special light through vision evidently helped to guide them to correct conclusions.

As nearly as we can ascertain, these two were the first of Sister White's published visions. The substance of these visions, with a few omissions, was republished in "Experience and Views" in 1851, with much other matter, and in "Early Writings" in 1882, and has doubtless been read by thousands of our people. They contain matter which has not by any means lost its interest yet, but which must have been most encouraging to the weary, waiting, disappointed, and heavy-hearted believers of 1846–7. No one who did not pass through that experience of the passing of the time, can possibly realize the load of sorrow they had to carry. Old believers often tell what a comfort to them these early visions were. We love to read them yet. There is not a word or a sentence in them to be ashamed of. Though the first of these was given in 1844, when she was but a mere unlettered, inexperienced girl, deprived of health by an accident, and hence even of the privileges of a common-school education, yet there is a beauty and power in these simple words which brings comfort to the heart of the believer after nearly forty years have passed away.

When these facts are understood, with all their attendant circumstances, these early visions become a strong evidence that God has ever been the source from which they have proceeded. Within the last few years there has been a strong desire among our people to procure the earlier writings of Sr. White. "Early Writings" was published last year to meet this want, and a large number of copies have been sold. These visions, with the exception of a few sentences, are contained in that volume. A few of our people have desired to obtain them exactly as they were originally published in "Word to the Little Flock." To gratify this desire, the Publishing Association has printed them entire in a little tract, and all who wish them can obtain them. It will be noticed by those who obtain this tract that there are letters placed in parentheses, and in one case the figures (666) as here given. The letters refer to corresponding passages of Scripture, and all these parenthetical references were evidently placed there by the publishers, and not by Sister White herself. They express the mind of those who published these visions that the scriptures referred to taught the same sentiments as those contained in the vision.

The New Recruits.

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

WE mean by "the new recruits" two writers in the *Sabbath Advocate*, who have recently, in a special supplement gotten out for circulation among our people, delivered themselves of five or six columns each of matter which none but apostates from our people could write. There is an intensity and bitterness in the expressions of such which it is hard for ordinary mortals to imitate. We refer to "Prof. A. Mc Learn," and the "eminent lawyer," J. S. Green. We do not propose in these columns to notice to any great extent what they say. It is hardly worth while. We think all candid persons will find no difficulty in discerning the spirit and animus of their articles. From a few specimen extracts they will readily discover whether they have the spirit of Christ or not. We should say that those who could be influenced by *such* articles might as well go with them at once. They could certainly not help us in our work of warning the world, and preparing for the coming of Christ. After such an exhibit of their temper and feelings, we feel honored by their denunciations of us, and pity those who have been so unfortunate as to have their praises. We feel it is much better to have some people denounce us than praise us.

"Prof. Mc Learn" starts out by heading his article, "An Unpleasant Duty," tells us that it is "with great reluctance" that he proceeds to discharge it, and says, "I have been well treated by the S. D. Adventist people." "There are many excellent people among them whom I love and respect." After mentioning a young man who had changed his mind concerning the meaning of a text of Scripture because of statements in Mrs. White's writings, he says:—

"And this is a fair sample of how the people are taught to stultify their judgment, ignore facts, and destroy their individuality. They are afraid to investigate the Scriptures, lest something will be discovered unfavorable to the positions taken by Mrs. White."

Our people will probably know how truthful this statement is without any comments of mine. Again he says:—

"No man who is known to doubt the Testimonies is allowed to hold any position of trust, nor is he fellowshiped by the leaders; and that means the church, for the people simply *do what*

they are told. The church *polity* makes it a hierarchy of the most despotic character." (Italics are his.)

We think this veracious statement will be rather startling news to most of our people. A few lines below he says, "Is Jesuitism more unreasonable and heartless?" By the way, is it not a little singular that this statement should be made that no one cherishing doubts of the visions "is allowed to hold any position of trust" among us, when in the same issue of the *Advocate* the editor claims to prove that Eld. U. Smith has no faith in the visions whatever; yet he holds the position of principal editor of our leading paper, and is a member of the Committee on Publications and of the Board of Trustees of the Publishing Association? We hardly know how to harmonize the statements of these *very truthful people.* Our readers may believe which of their statements they choose, or what is safer, *neither of them.*

But we proceed to give a few more utterances from Prof. Mc Learn:—

"Now we know that these men are not sincere in what they declare. We mean the men who are now in authority, and are working for the sake of personal aggrandizement."

The writer is forced to take this statement as referring largely to himself, because a few sentences below he is singled out as *the* one specially in mind. We suppose our worthy colleagues will have to share a little of it with us, and possibly Bro. Smith must take a little of it also, seeing he is so unfortunate as to be still in office. It would seem from these grave statements of the "Professor's" that our people might better be hunting up a better class of men to place in positions of authority,—men who are not hypocrites, but "sincere," and men who are not looking for their own "aggrandizement" alone,—such men, probably, as Prof. Mc Learn, and the "eminent lawyer," Mr. Green.

Again, let the "Professor" speak:—

"And indeed a large proportion of the most intelligent of the S. D. Adventist people are perplexed and confused by the glaring inconsistencies of Mrs. White. They feel the demoralizing effect of this horrible nightmare that is distressing and destroying the church, and groan on account of it. There is not a minister in the denomination who feels that he is a *free man.* If he does not believe the Testimonies, he must either act the hypocrite or *walk the plank*, crushed under the iron heel of ecclesiastical despotism."

What surprising discoveries and fearful denouements the "Professor" has brought forth! One would think S. D. Adventists had restored all the ancient paraphernalia of persecution,—racks, thumbscrews, the fagot, and the dungeon,—with which to destroy the good people who will not believe in Mrs. White. And yet he says he has been "well treated" by this people. Is it not strange he has got away with his life? How is it that he can understand so well the feelings of every minister among us, when he never saw one-half of them in his life? It is strange we should all stay in a church where we feel we are slaves. We should suppose there would be a regular stampede to follow the "Professor's" example, and go over to our S. D. Baptist brethren. But we have not heard of it yet.

Speaking of Sister White's explanation of a certain vision which he claims to think is very absurd, he uses the following language:—

"It is insulting to the intelligence of decent people. It is trifling with sacred things. It is blasphemy in the sight of God. But why will not the people rise in the majesty of their blood-bought rights, and shake off this destructive incubus?"

How strange that so gentle and kindly a man as Prof. Mc Learn has usually appeared, could utter such language as this we are quoting! It can only be accounted for by the fact that he has become inoculated with the Marion virus of bitterness.

In speaking of the College, he pretends that Sister White disapproves of education, because she fears our people will become intelligent, and reject her counsels. "The *real* purpose is to prevent those under her influence from becoming enlightened, that they may the more easily become her willing dupes." Just as though our people did not everywhere know that the voice and pen of Mrs. White have done ten times more in behalf of education among our people than those of any other person in our ranks! He says furthermore:—

"You have too heavy a load to carry. You cannot cover such crooked tracks as Mrs. White has made for you. You are educated to deceive by means of her blasphemous pretensions. You are not free men, and you know it."

And so on with nearly six columns of like tenor. And this is the kind of reward our people get for the good usage which he says he has received among us. Well, this is not so much Prof. McLearn as the "anti-vision" virus which he has been drinking down in such large draughts among his new acquaintances. Poor man! he is to be truly pitied.

We cannot afford as much space for the effusions of Mr. Green, the "eminent lawyer." He uses this language of Eld. Waggoner, one of our ablest and most faithful laborers, one of the pioneers in this church of which Green still claims to be a member:—

"He is an old hand at such deceptive work, is paid for doing so, has a greater influence in deceiving our people than he is willing to allow that I have in the Advent faith. He is one of those old and tried visionists, who, under the lead of Ellen G. White, believed their work for sinners ceased in 1844."

Eld. W. never embraced the Advent faith till after 1844; so of course, if this statement is true, he must have believed he was lost himself. It would be a peculiar thing for a man to zealously embrace a doctrine which taught his own damnation. Who can think Mr. Green himself believed his own statement?

This is a fair specimen of his accusations. They are largely a rehash of those just quoted, charging upon us that we are all in bondage and deception, trying to compare Sister White to Jo. Smith, and asserting that S. D. Adventists and Roman Catholics are much alike in spirit and church polity. And still he seems determined to stop with us, and boasts of his continued membership in such a church. It seems strange and wonderful how men who a year or two ago were among us, kind and friendly, and who seemed to be interested in all that pertains to the prosperity of this cause, could become so bitter, so unreasonable, and so cruel in their statements. If giving up faith in the visions of Mrs. White affects men in this way, as it seems to do in almost every case, we may well pray to our heavenly Father to preserve us from such a calamity.

This point, when properly considered, becomes one of the strongest evidences that the visions are from a good source, and opposition to them from an evil source. "By their fruits ye shall know them." We have known of scores of men in our experience who were kind, candid, humble, and agreeable; but something came up which soured them against the visions. Perhaps they were reproved, or some of their friends were, or they taught something which displeased them, or their track was crossed in some way. Perhaps they had been ministers, and souls were converted under their labors, and they were doing good. But all at once the change came. They became bitter, unreasonable, and would make the most extravagant and unjust charges against those whom they had formerly considered their best friends. They began to hunt up everything they could rake and scrape to blacken the reputation of Sister White, and destroy faith in those pure and elevating Testimonies. Things that once would have had no weight as objections, now became magnified into mountains of difficulty. Their principal meat and drink seemed to be to denounce Mrs. White and all who had faith in her work. From our hearts we pity such victims. In charity we can only hope they know not what spirit they are of. But having seen so many such cases during the last twenty years, any recent examples do not surprise us. These last two recruits are only following the old familiar example. But the work of God has been able to stand through a "Messenger" movement, the Snook and Brinkerhoff defection, Charles Lee's departure, H. C Blanchard's denunciations, and many other lesser apostasies, including these "two new recruits" to the opposition ranks. And yet its course is onward with a steady growth, and never were there more hopeful indications of its final success. We are sorry for those who act so unwisely; the loss to them is far greater than to the cause.

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and *whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.*"

The Advocate Extra.

BY ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.

IN 1855 the "*Messenger* party" greatly exulted over their anticipated triumph over the Seventh-day Adventists. They confidently expected to see us give way, and yield to their demand that we should renounce "the Testimonies." They brought themselves to really believe that "the visions" were the great stumbling-block to our people, and hindrance to the success of the message. They prophesied that many would leave us if we clung to the visions, while thousands would unite with us if we renounced them. The latter they could not know; and we knew that *numbers* could never make up for the rejection of any point of present truth,—for quenching the Spirit and despising prophesyings. See 1 Thess. 5:19, 20, and context. And being quite well acquainted with the parties who were grumbling and complaining, we were not intimidated by the threat that such would leave us; for we knew that in very few cases would the departure weaken our cause. From that time to this it has been asserted that all the men of education and talent leave the S. D. Adventists, being cramped by the visions. But that is not true. I cannot now call to mind a single individual of liberal education who was ever thoroughly with us, who has left us. Very few educated men have ever come among us, and they are mostly now with us. The ministers who have left us were not educated men. And the visions do not restrain any from the exercise of any privilege to which they have a just right as Christians. If they ask more than that,—if they want to receive reverence because of their ability, without regard to their Christian standing and their devotion to the cause,—then we hope we shall always have *something* among us that will act as a check on their selfish ambition.

Instead of weakening on account of their crusade against "the testimony of Jesus," we firmly avowed our conviction that it was a part of "the present truth," a necessary means of bringing us to the unity of the faith and spirit, and God vindicated our position for his truth's sake. The cause revived and prospered. Our enemies were scattered,—literally broken to fragments. Thus they proved that the visions were not the cause of disunion as far as they were concerned. They professed to believe the message, and they had a paper, and they rejected the visions; but the thousands did not join them! But the real believers in the message were more firmly united than before.

We are passing through a similar experience at present. A party who "know not what they do," are trying to drive us from our position, telling us how many we have lost, and how much we will lose, if we cling to the Testimonies. But we are not ignorant in these matters. When they publish to the world that Elds. Hull, Cornell, and others left us because of the visions, they only subject themselves to scorn. If they know no better, they are ignorant indeed. We know better. And this proves that this *Advocate* party is animated by a blind, unreasoning, prejudice, determined to carry their points regardless of the truth in the case. In almost every case where individuals have left us professedly on account of the visions, we know that that was the pretense; the real cause lay further back. Quite often it has been on account of the visions exposing and reproving the primary cause, and they, "willing to justify themselves," say they leave because of the visions. And this far they speak the truth: if there were no means of exposing selfishness; if they could gratify their ambition, and have their own way unrestrained, they might not leave us. Thus far are the visions the cause of their departure. But we do not deplore it; rather we rejoice in it. Our strength and prosperity depend upon these things.

The "*Advocate Extra*" causes me thus to "call to remembrance the former days." When the "Sunday question" was thrown into politics, and made the great—the only—issue in our State election last year, we felt assured that this was the beginning of a more aggressive movement toward the union of church and state. Their defeat made them no less determined, but turned their attention more to the national issue, where, and not in state action, only can they succeed. We have watched the skies since that time, and see many evidences

of the coming storm. In a most surprising manner a spirit of inquiry is awakened among the people at large, and our publications are called for as never before. The subscription list of our "pioneer paper" has nearly doubled during the present year. The Spirit of God is moving the people, preparing for a mighty work in the third angel's message.

And this vigorous movement on the part of the "Marion party" is another sign of the same thing. We have never known a revival of the work of God without Satan making just such efforts to counteract it. And we cannot deplore the event. It will turn to the benefit of the cause of truth. It will no doubt result in the overthrow of some, and they who instigate and abet the movement incur a terrible responsibility on that account. It will cause others who are lukewarm, lacking zeal in the spirit of the message, to take a decided stand on one side or the other. And whichever side they take, the result will be beneficial to the cause on which they merely hang in a half-hearted manner.

I have no desire to notice much in this "Extra." I leave that to others if they think it necessary. I have elsewhere noticed the principles and the main facts involved. To those acquainted with the facts, most of the statements in this "Extra" appear ridiculous. Instance the following from J. S. Green. Speaking of me, he says:—

"He is one of those old and tried visionists, who, under the lead of the visions of Ellen G. White, believed that their work for sinners ceased in 1844. While under that delusion, he used to travel hundreds of miles to see and encourage those of the same faith. I wonder if he still adheres to this old delusion, to wit, that his work for sinners ended in 1844?"

Now it is generally known by those acquainted with me that I was not an Adventist until 1851; that I never heard a sermon on the advent in the first or 1844 message; and it is truth that when I embraced the advent faith, having never been acquainted with the Adventists, I did not know that *anybody ever* believed that the work for sinners ended in 1844; that I never saw a preacher of any kind who believed it; in all my travels I never met with a person who believed it; I never, to my knowledge, saw more than one person who believed it, and I did not know it when I saw him, but heard it reported of him afterward; and that when I first became acquainted with Bro. and Sr. White, they were laboring for all classes, as they ever did afterward, without any intimation that their work was limited to any class or classes. The above from J. S. Green is not only false in every thought and particular, but ridiculously false. A little knowledge with his blind zeal might save him from making many false statements which he is so free to make now. This is a specimen of the reliability of the contents of the "Extra."

Again, his notice of my saying that Sister Addie Harvey was the second wife of Bro. Harvey, is deceptive, a mere cavil, unworthy of a man pretending to any honesty. He tries to leave the impression on the reader that I made a false statement; and any one knowing nothing of the circumstances, and believing his word, and reading what he says of me,—thus: "He is an old hand at deception;" and "has a greater interest in deceiving our people," etc.,—would suppose I had intentionally deceived, and would take it for granted that she was his first wife. Now I will confess that I had no *personal knowledge* that Bro. Harvey was ever married to any woman before he was married to Sister Addie. But I had such confidence in him, and in the accomplished lady with whom he lived, and who was known in the community as his wife, whose hospitality I often shared, that I really believed they were married, and that she was his lawful wife; *and I believe it still.* Mr. Green may know that he had been married *twice* before his marriage to Sister Addie; but I do not know it. Then she would have been his third wife. But that would not at all change the nature of my statement; and Mr. Green knew this, therefore he tries to cast discredit on my word without giving any explanation to inform the mind of the reader, if he had such information. Perhaps I ought not to be surprised at his course; for I learn by this "Extra" that he is "an eminent lawyer" (I was also ignorant of that fact), and this may be characteristic of that wing of the legal fraternity to which he belongs. It looks to me, however, very much like the act of a quibbling pettifogger.

He refers to our holding the General Conference at Rome, N. Y., as though it were a great offense. But he has hardly been with us long enough, or occupied that position among us, to claim a right to dictate to us in such matters. Other church organizations move their Conferences from place to place continually, as we do our State Conferences. There is nothing in our organization to forbid our doing so. In this talk he may show his spirit, but he can never convince anybody that any wrong was done.

And his legal ability was shown in the opinion which he volunteered that, if we carried out our intentions to examine at Rome into the condition of our institutions, and to there ascertain the will of the stockholders concerning them, such expressed will to be carried out at the legal meeting in Battle Creek, we would endanger their charters! In California the laws are more restrictive in reference to corporation meetings than they are in Michigan. When we incorporated our College, we selected a lawyer in San Francisco as our counselor, and he is also a stockholder, but not an Adventist. I do not know that he is a professor of religion at all; nor do I know that he has ever been published as "an eminent lawyer," but he is reliable and honorable, and that is far better. In order to get the minds of our stockholders without subjecting them to much travel, I suggested that we hold our annual College meeting sometime after our camp-meeting, where the stockholders would most likely be; that there we could ascertain their will in regard to the affairs of the College, take the proxies of those who could not or did not wish to go to Healdsburg, and then at the legal meeting carry out the wishes of the majority as previously expressed at the camp-meeting. Our counsel approved the plan as judicious, in every way meeting the requirements of the law, and one which could not fail to be satisfactory to the stockholders. But this action in the East, Mr. Green stigmatized as dangerous to the existence of our institutions at Battle Creek. With due deference to his great legal acquirements, I am free to say *we knew better.* He has not yet got over his sorcness on account of this movement. He says at Rome "the people knew the least about the management of our institutions which were located at Battle Creek." That may be a good reason for moving our meetings; let the people at large become acquainted with them. Further than this, he may learn that the business of our Conference is done by delegates, and the affairs of the institutions are controlled by the majority of the stock as represented, not by the people of Rome or Battle Creek.

Mr. Green is not the first one who has come among us whose strength and interest are manifested in finding fault with everything which he cannot manipulate. But if he has done that for the cause which would entitle him to a leading position, I have never heard of it. He says that he has an interest in these matters, as he is a member of the church. This may be. But if it shall fall to my lot to go East again, I shall try to remedy that unfortunate circumstance by bringing charges against him, not for disbelief of the visions, which he would fain have people believe is the universal ground of action, but for publishing falsehoods with malicious intention, namely, to injure the reputation of members of the church and laborers in the cause. If put to the proof on his statements, his unfitness for church-membership will be manifest to all. This is my only answer at present to some other matters of which he has spoken.

Having now given this matter all the attention to which it is fairly entitled, I leave it, and I trust, finally, except as above indicated.

A Brief History of the "Marion" Movement.

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

WE feel it is a duty which we owe to those of our people who are young in the faith to give them a brief history of the origin and work of those who are so persistent in their attacks upon our people and the visions. Having long lived in Iowa, we have had an intimate acquaintance with this whole movement from its rise. It is not a pleasant subject, and were it not that they are making the most strenuous efforts to flood our churches with their tracts and extras, we would not say a word concerning them. It is purely a work of self-defense. They have complained that no attention was paid to their utterances. It is a subject we wish to avoid as far as possible, and would rather attend to our legitimate work of warning the world of the coming of Christ. But at times, when the inexperienced are endangered by our silence, we feel it a duty to speak out. Every statement we make we are able to verify by abundance of proof.

In May, 1865, Elds. B. F. Snook and W. H. Brinkerhoff, the president and secretary of the Iowa Conference, and the only ministers in it, attended the General Conference of our people, held in Battle Creek, Mich. They came there in all apparent friendship, and associated with their ministering brethren, and took part in the Conference proceedings, in apparent good faith; but according to their confessions afterward, they "were on the lookout to see if they could not find something to reproach" us with. They parted with the Christian salutation, and with professions of love; but before they had got far away, they began to show forth their spirit of hostility and treachery.

They returned to Iowa, and were actively engaged in going from church to church, telling falsehoods about Bro. and Sr. White and the Battle Creek church. This they confessed themselves. Taking advantage of their influence in this way, they destroyed the confidence of many good brethren in Iowa in the cause they had loved. In July, Bro. White appointed a general meeting at Pilot Grove, Ia., and many invitations were sent out, and a large attendance secured. I was present. One day was spent in considering the stories they had been telling, and Bro. White and others replying to them. The result was such that many who had come there with strong confidence in them lost it, and their followers dwindled away, and at last the men themselves confessed their wicked course.

Bro. and Sr. White went to Marion, and spent some time with them, and apparent union was restored. Elds. Snook and Brinkerhoff both wrote out confessions which were published in the REVIEW, copies of which can be seen in the book written by Eld. Smith in answer to the objections to the visions. In these confessions they admitted that they were in a "state of darkness," had been "led by the wicked one," had acted a dishonorable and wicked part, had abused the kindness and confidence of the friends of the cause, and begged for mercy and forgiveness. We should be glad to have all read these confessions for themselves.

In a very few months they turned back to the same course again, and returned to the service of the "one" they previously confessed they had been following. They came to Michigan to the remnants of the old "Messenger party," who had years before been engaged in the same warfare against the visions and our people, procured what printing material they could, which had been left after the collapse of the old *Hope of Israel*, and started their paper in Marion, Ia. They went from church to church in that State, and did their utmost to destroy the confidence of our people in the work and in the visions. They had great advantages at the time, as they had been the only ministers of our people in the State, and the principal officers in the Conference; but they were met here and there, and soon their influence was broken. Several churches, however, were broken up, and perhaps one-third of the membership went with them for a time.

After a comparatively brief period, when these men found they were not going to accomplish all they had hoped to, their zeal waned, and they both went off into Universalism. The Iowa Conference, after passing through this crisis, and having the doubting, discordant elements removed from it, soon recovered from its effects, and made a most rapid growth. In a very few years it more than doubled its strength, and has become one of our strongest Conferences. Some of those who had been deceived by these movements returned to us, and have been valuable members. In several places where churches had gone down under these influences, better churches have been built up.

Those who were left after Snook and Brinkerhoff left them, have been dragging out a lingering existence ever since. They have most of the time kept up their paper. We believe it did stop a few months after their interesting experience with the notorious Fuller, referred to in another column; but it is still published.

It may be said, Why refer to Elds. Snook and Brinkerhoff, since they have closed their connection with them? We answer, The inception and birth of every religious movement goes far to show its nature. If the beginning bears the mark of a divine origin, it stamps the movement itself as of the right character, and *vice versa*. The history of the past verifies this. All Bible believers look back to the time when God moved upon Noah, Moses, John the Baptist, and the apostles, and discern the divine hand in every one of these cases. Their work was of God. So of Luther, Wesley, William Miller, and many others. These were moved out by the Spirit of God, and good fruits mark the progress of their work. We claim the same origin and results in this movement that we are engaged in.

But this was not so with Mahomet and Joseph Smith, neither is it true of spiritualism. While they make loud professions, we easily see the deceptive character of their origin. Here is an important principle by which to test every work: "The tree is known by its fruits. Either make the tree good, and its fruit good, or the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt. Every tree is known by its fruit." The tree is the origin, the fruit the results.

It seems almost cruel to apply these well-established principles to the movement of which we are speaking, and we pity those who are so blind in it that they cannot discern these things. Here is a movement, which, according to the confession of both those who led out in it, started in deception, was led by the devil, was a violation of confidence and trust reposed in them by the friends of the cause, and was marked by treachery and ingratitude. From our own personal knowledge, we believe these confessions told the truth, though much more of the same sort might be added to them. This movement, then, in its inception, stands condemned by its own leaders, who were far the ablest men who have ever been engaged in it. It started in deception, and it has never yet extricated itself from that atmosphere. It would be a wearisome and unprofitable task to follow it through all its various meanderings and experiences. We shall not undertake it. We will but briefly notice a few more points.

Suffice it to say, that after S. and B. became Universalists, and they were deprived of their leading lights, things dragged somewhat, till finally one Goodenough (we always thought the first half of his name was a misnomer), from Wisconsin, came to their rescue. He was one who had greatly desired to preach among us, but there were certain weaknesses in his character which prevented it. He was joyously welcomed at Marion, and made us some little trouble here and there in our new churches, where the character of this movement was not well known. He became quite prominent for a while with them; but finally some difficulty and strife came into their counsels, and his weaknesses becoming unpleasantly prominent, he retired, and started another little movement of his own.

Nathan Fuller sojourned in Marion toward a year, and for a time was made much of, and did considerable preaching for them. His son worked in their office much longer, and was, according to the best of our recollection, elected to some prominent position. We know nothing against his moral character. But in the troubles among them arising from Goodenough and his (Fuller's) father, etc., there came a split; and their General Conference went one way, and their Publishing Association another, and for several months the paper ceased to be printed. In giving a history of any movement, it seems necessary that some account should be given of the troubles through which it passes.

Things by this time had come to a low ebb. Jacob Brinkerhoff, the present editor, the brother of the one we have mentioned before, and one of the worthiest among them, was induced to return, and try to revive the paper. He had gone away to work in a secular printing office, rather in disgust. He took it as his own private property. (We believe their Publishing Association had collapsed.) He has labored with an earnestness worthy of a better cause, and has managed to keep the paper afloat.

In recent years the Long brothers, of Missouri, have come to the rescue, and seem to furnish most of the bone and sinew of the party. They figure as the principal controversialists, and have most to say of the "terrible fanaticism" of the S. D. Adventists, the "awful despotism" of Mrs. White, and the "Jesuitical hierarchy" at Battle Creek. They are at present very active, because we had some troubles with our College at Battle Creek last year under the administration of "Prof. McLearn," which resulted in the closing of it for one year. But as these now seem happily over, and the prospect of its starting again under better auspices seems fair, we hardly know what will furnish them with their next ammunition. The "two recruits" spoken of elsewhere have also encouraged Eld. A. C. Long to great earnestness of late. If it were not so serious a question, it would be amusing to see the amount of crocodile tears these men shed at the terrible condition of S. A. Adventists, and their great sorrow (?) at being obliged to speak of our wickedness. One would judge from their words that they were forced, under a stern sense of duty which was terribly painful to them, to speak of these things, if he didn't know that all through their history for the past eighteen years there has been no theme to compare with this in interest to them. This has been their leading stock in trade, and their main bond of union. So anxious have they been to welcome any one from our ranks that they have badly burned their fingers by picking up those in several instances whom we had cast off as bankrupt in character.

In closing this chapter of history, we must not forget to mention the two last recruits, Prof. McLearn, and J. S. Green, whom they call the "eminent lawyer." (We think he has been as high in position as justice of the peace, if not higher.) Like all new converts, we judge from their recent utterances, that they are trying to equal or excel their predecessors in this movement. Who will drop in next, we are not able to say; but we can assure all prospective candidates, You will meet with a most cordial reception. Judging from the past, we should not anticipate any very close inspection of your character, if you only have *one qualification*,—dislike to the visions of Mrs. White, and can denounce them strongly enough. And we would cordially advise all who think they would like to train in that company to enlist at once.

In conclusion, we would speak briefly of the present condition and influence of this movement. It is about seventeen years since their paper started in Iowa. We have not visited Marion for a few years past, but the last time we were there we found their printing office in a medium-sized room in a private dwelling, the editor's house. (It had at first occupied quite a large brick building.) The editor, his wife, and one hired girl, attended to the domestic duties, and did the printing. I should judge he made a fair living out of the business, with the help of his garden, advertising, etc. If hard work and sacrificing for their cause were worth anything, he would certainly be entitled to credit; for he has done more of these than all of the rest of that company we ever knew. Their work there may have increased some recently; we understand they publish their paper oftener; but we have never learned of any special increase. Their church in Marion, which, according to the best of our knowledge, numbered some fifty or so when they first drew off from us, had dwindled down quite small by removals and otherwise. Though well acquainted in the State of Iowa, we do not now know of another church of theirs in the State which keeps up regular Sabbath meetings, or, in fact, of any other church at all. We believe they have a very few companies in Missouri; at least they did some years since. And though we have traveled much through the country, we know of scarcely any other churches of this people that pretend to keep up public worship.

But have they not quite a numerous membership here and there?—Yes; there are quite a number scattered in various places who sustain their organ, the *Advocate*. These hold a great variety of religious views. For years their paper had a standing notice at the head of a column, something like this: "The editor holds himself responsible only for editorials and selections." Hence the contents of the paper were a sort of religious *hash*. One could get a great variety. You could be treated to "Sabbath," "life and death," the "soon coming of Christ" and the "age to come," "non-resurrection of the wicked," "no devil," etc., etc.; but especially to a large amount concerning the awful wickedness of Mrs. White's deceptions, and the terrible errors of S. D. Adventists. By accommodating all these different views, the paper has been enabled to live, if not to thrive. There are enough peculiar people in the world who hold some pet notion, and really want some place to ventilate it in, and the *Advocate* is handy for such. They want *freedom*, and here they can find it. But how do these people, with such diversified views, manage to get along together? Why, there is one bond of union to which none of them ever fail to respond, and that is opposition to the visions. All understand this key-note. It is the slogan which never fails to arouse them to battle.

At the present time this movement seems to be quite lively. They have received two new recruits, and hope for more. It has been quite a while since they have had any important accessions. Of course they will keep these gifts in lively exercise till they are worn out. We judge from present appearances this will not be long.

Well, on the whole, we are inclined to take this matter quite philosophically. We think perhaps this movement has a place in the economy of Providence. It furnishes a convenient *lighting place* for those who murmur and complain; for those whose heads are sore; for those who cannot endure the straitness of the way, and the pure teachings of the Spirit of God; for those who want a change, and "more *freedom;*" and, in short, for those who cannot harmonize with the spirit of our work. Why should we not recognize this necessity, and keep cool, and let every one find his proper place? But while we feel thus, we want every one to understand the facts, so that they may act freely, and know what they are doing. For this cause we have written this brief history of the "Marion" movement. We could add much more of a similar tenor. But perhaps this is sufficient.

The Harvey Estate.

BY H. W. KELLOGG.

IN J. S. Green's articles in the *Advocate Extra*, he makes statements that are erroneous and misleading in regard to the Harvey estate, and as I have some knowledge of the facts, a statement of them may be proper.

On the 15th of January, 1877, James Harvey, and Adeline P. Harvey, his wife, deeded to Eld. James White all of the real estate that they owned in Indiana (Bro. and Sr. White, being in California at the time, knew nothing whatever of the transaction), and assigned to him three notes on which there was due $4,844.47. He also, at the same time, made payable by indorsement to Uriah Smith seven other notes, on which there was due $891.75. One or two days later, Bro. Smith, at Bro. Harvey's request, transferred these notes to James White. Bro. Harvey at the same time deeded to his wife his property in Battle Creek, and made his will, leaving to his wife property, which, together with that deeded to her, he considered worth $3,000. Bro. Harvey put the papers which he had made out to Eld. White into the hands of Eld. S. H. Lane, to have them recorded, and delivered at the REVIEW Office for Bro. White when he should return from California. This Bro. Lane did about the time of Bro. Harvey's death, which occurred early in March.

When Eld. White returned from California some months later, he found that notes, claims, and suits, had been brought against Wm. R. Carpenter, the executor of Bro. Harvey's estate, amounting in the aggregate to over $5,000. Some of these claims were settled without litigation; others were believed to be unjust, and expensive law-suits followed, and judgments were rendered against the estate in the most important ones.

The money to meet these expenses and settle these claims was furnished by Eld. White from the funds received from Bro. Harvey. The amount realized from the sale of property deeded to Eld. White was some less than thirty-five hundred dollars ($3,500); this, with the notes, would make only a small amount over nine thousand dollars put into Eld. White's hands (and not nearly twenty thousand, as J. S. Green would have us believe), if all the notes had been collectable, but some of them were not. From this fund, Eld. White put $800 into the S. D. A. Educational Society as from Bro. and Sr. Harvey, and I believe a like sum into the Oakland church, also $100 into the ten-thousand-dollar fund. About one month before his death, Eld. White sent to Indiana for Wm. R. Carpenter, the executor, to come to Battle Creek, and

bring his accounts and papers, for the purpose of determining just how the Harvey matter stood, as Bro. C. had collected money on the notes, and settled claims, etc. He also sent for Eld. J. Fargo, president of the Michigan Conference; for the same purpose, as the real estate in Indiana was in his hands. These brethren came, and Bro. White and the writer spent several hours with them in looking up this matter. The result of this investigation showed that of the amount which had then been received there was in Eld. White's hands twenty-seven hundred dollars belonging to the Harvey trust fund. From this time until after Eld. White's death (Aug. 6, 1881), no change was made in the fund. The execution of the trust then fell upon Sister White. The REVIEW Office charged James White's estate with the twenty-seven hundred dollars, and credited the same to E. G. White, "Harvey Trust Fund," and it never was placed to her personal account; and further, not a dollar of this fund was ever in her hands, only as on the Office books, as above stated. Sister White did not, nor did any of her family, ever have the use or the handling of a dollar of this fund.

In July, 1882, this fund received further credits by cash from J. Fargo, balance from sale of land after deducting expenses, $1,287.10, and cash per W. R. Carpenter, collection, $5.00, making a total of $3,992.10 in the fund for E. G. White to appropriate, to complete the execution of the trust. This she did by ordering charged to this fund, and credited—

To the European Mission,	$2,395.26
" " English "	798.42
" " Danish "	798.42
	3,992.10

During the spring and summer of 1882, J. S. Green wrote one or more letters to Sister White, in which he threatened to bring a suit against her to compel her to pay over to Sister Harvey a portion of this trust fund, and went so far as to put the matter in the hands of a law firm in this city. Sister White very properly refused to treat with or recognize him in the matter, and sent his letters to the General Conference Committee; and decided to execute the trust according to the expressed wishes of Bro. Harvey, leaving the General Conference Committee, who had charge of the different mission funds of our people, and who were here on the ground, and knew of the circumstances of Sr. H., to do as they thought best about letting her have money from the funds which had received donations from the Harvey trust fund.

In the execution of this trust, Bro. White made no charge for his time or services, and did not, nor did any of his family, receive a penny for such time or service. It is doubtful if ever a trust was executed in a more conscientious manner, or with greater fidelity.

The representation made by J. S. G. that at the time he wrote demanding money for Sr. H., the "little property" Bro. H. had left her was "nearly exhausted" is without foundation, as he well knows. The facts are that on the property, which was free from incumbrance, Sr. H. had made quite extensive improvements, costing not less than one thousand dollars, and she was owing not to exceed six hundred dollars at the time.

Now a word in reference to J. S. G.'s statements about the value of Eld. White's estate. He says that that portion of it in Calhoun county was appraised at over twenty-seven thousand dollars. Now, as one of the appraisers, I deny the statement, and assert that this estimate included all the property of which he died possessed, both real and personal; and that this appraisal was too high is proved by the fact that the portion of the property which has been sold did not bring the appraised value. He is careful not to mention the fact that there were claims against the estate, amounting to several thousand dollars, that when paid would reduce it considerably below twenty thousand. His insinuation that Sister White fled from this city to California as a guilty criminal, is a silly and baseless fabrication. We cannot but believe this attack upon Bro. and Sr. White to be malicious in intent, satanic in origin, and slanderous and libelous in its publication.

NOTE BY ELD. BUTLER.

The above statement by Bro. Kellogg concerning the estate of Bro. Harvey, I hereby heartily indorse in reference to many of the statements, which have come under my own observation, and I fully believe them all to be true. Mr. Green's attempt to blacken the reputation of Bro. and Sr. White by insinuations that they had misappropriated sacred funds given for the benefit of the cause of God, and had used them for their own personal benefit, will never be believed by those who know them well, but will simply be regarded as an evidence of his malignity. For more than forty years they had labored ardently for the cause of God and the good of their fellow-men, and had established a reputation for integrity and conscientiousness which is well known, not only among our people, but through this whole community. They enjoyed the confidence and respect of the best citizens of Battle Creek. Most people have too much self-respect to try to malign the dead.

We do not need to go far to ascertain the cause of Mr. Green's malice. During and after the College troubles, his egotism and officiousness in seeking to manage this and that matter which our people had intrusted to others, was not treated with all the deference which he desired. But little attention was paid to him. His letters to Sister White threatening a law-suit if certain demands of his were not complied with, his putting the matters in question into a lawyer's hands (though such an "eminent lawyer" himself), his utter failure to accomplish anything by so doing, and the perfect indifference with which the whole matter was treated by those in charge, have left Mr. Green's spirits somewhat ruffled; and the afflicted, weary, and worn servant of God, and her dead husband, must needs have their names smutted through the *Advocate*. Well, this shows the taste and self-respect of those who do it, but is not, perhaps, a matter of very much importance, the animus being so obvious.

Bro. Kellogg's statement of the appropriation of the balance of Bro. Harvey's estate to the funds specified by Sister White, I know to be correct. These funds are under the control of the General Conference Committee. She counseled us to consider Sister Harvey's condition, and if she was really in affliction, and needy, to regard her wants. She had been sick, and was somewhat in debt, with an aged mother dependent upon her; and as we considered she had not received fully the share of her husband's estate the law would have given her, we placed in her hands $1,000, believing this would have been in harmony with her husband's mind had he been alive, in view of the present circumstances of his widow. Sister Harvey expressed her gratitude for this act, and stated that she was perfectly satisfied with what we had done, and well knew she could not have obtained a cent of it but for our voluntary bestowal of it. We did it because we thought it was right and just. Mr. Green's claim that he "squeezed $1,000 out of the White estate" for Sister Harvey, is just as true as if he had said it was done by the king of the cannibal islands, and no more so. He had threatened, and blustered, and showed his egotism, but had utterly failed to accomplish anything, and he very well knows it.

The Short-Dress Objection.

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

PERHAPS there is no objection urged against the visions with more pertinacity than this about the short dress. It is well known that for several years Sister White advocated a style of dress some eight or nine inches from the floor, with pants clothing the lower extremities; and that the Testimonies taught that this style of dress would be sensible, healthful, and well pleasing to God. But this dress was never made a test, and there were some classes, such as the aged, and those whose husbands were opposed to it, and others, whom Sister White did not advise to wear it. To others she did recommend it, but never approved of its being pressed upon those who were unwilling to wear it, as a test, by their brethren and sisters.

It may be proper to give a few of the reasons which she assigned why such a dress should be worn. It was thought it would be preferable to have some sensible, established style of dress for our sisters to wear, rather than to follow the fickle, changeable, ridiculous fashions which emanate from the godless city of Paris. The tyranny of fashion at the present day is marvelous. If any church or ruler required such changes in dressing, it would be thought unbearable. Had Mrs. White recommended and tried to enforce anything in the dress line one-tenth as objectionable as many things which are put on by Christian ladies in obedience to the goddess Fashion, she would have been abused, if possible, far worse than she is at present.

It was claimed for this reform dress that it was a healthful dress; that it avoided tight lacing; that its weight was supported from the shoulders; that it protected the lower extremities, was not in the way when going up stairs, avoided the filth of the streets and the wet grass after dew or rain, and was in many ways preferable to the fashionable dresses usually worn. Many not of our people liked the appearance of the dress when tastily worn; others did not. It was claimed to be in harmony with the Bible requirements of plainness and simplicity of dress. It was thought that it would be a means of helping our young people to keep away from worldly society, as they would not care to go where their dress was a subject of remark, and was not popular; and as the people of God anciently had the ribband of blue upon their garments to distinguish them from the world around them (Num. 15:38), so it would be well that God's people now should differ in their dress from the world, for the same reason.

These reasons have much weight, even to-day; and if the proposed change had been cheerfully made, we are sure much good would have resulted; but the effort to make this change cost us much labor and trouble. From the first there was much opposition to it. It is a sad fact that many of our sisters do not desire to differ from the world in dress; on the contrary, they desire to imitate them as much as posible. While there was on the part of many of our most humble and devoted sisters an acceptance of the dress in good faith, on the part of many others there were complaints, fault-findings, murmurings, heart-burnings, etc., innumerable. Some lacked taste in putting it on, and it appeared unbecoming. Others made it the main theme of their discourse, and a main point in their religious faith, tested their sisters by it, and had little faith in those who did not wear it. They became narrow and bigoted and exclusive. They made the dress, which was designed as a blessing, a galling yoke.

The trouble which grew out of these things was great, not because there was anything about the dress which was ridiculous, but because of the unreasonable course concerning it pursued by many. Our ministers were forced to spend much time to keep the elements quiet, and to talk about the dress question. Sister White had often to speak about it at large meetings, to try to get some to take a reasonable, sensible course, but did not always succeed. I could give many particulars on this point, if necessary. Suffice it to say, that a point was reached where it became evident that the short dress, which was designed to be a blessing to our people, became an actual hindrance to the cause, because of the unreasonable course of many among us concerning it. Sister White ceased to speak in its behalf, and did not wear it herself, and it soon ceased to be generally worn.

Many had said they were willing to dress plainly, if not required to wear the short dress. They did not like that, and found many things they considered objectionable about it, etc., etc. These were taken at their word; but many of them soon showed that their hearts were really longing for worldly fashions, and their objections to the short dress were merely excuses. Many of those who opposed the short dress most violently, just as soon as the change was made, turned around and found even more fault with Sister White than before. Ever since that time, there has been quite a large class who have used this dress question as their strongest objection to the visions. Though they hated the short dress, and did all they could to oppose it, or murmured and complained about it, and made it hard for those who upheld it, yet as soon as it was dropped, they began to find fault with that, and said it was inconsistent to leave it off, and a strong evidence against the visions being of God. They said Sister White had pursued a very unreasonable course, and how could they have any confidence in her? etc., etc. It is a very hard thing to please some people, especially when the murmuring spirit is in their hearts.

Of course our enemies have made the most of this, and have done their best to deepen and intensify these feelings. They exclaim in their "Extra:" "Just think of this idea! the Lord giving them a particular style of dress, and because they would not wear it, he modifies his directions to suit their taste!" "Does the Lord ever lower his standards to suit people's tastes or ways?" They have here placed this objection in just as strong a light as they are capable of placing it, and we propose to take hold of it, and show from the Bible that in some things the Lord does accommodate his requirements to people's ways, even when he would prefer they should do some other and better way. Though he does not always do it, or do it concerning some of his requirements, or generally

do it, yet in matters of lesser moment, and of expediency, where he has recommended a better way he sometimes permits them to follow their own choice, though it always proves less beneficial to them than if they had done as he directed. We propose to prove this too plainly for denial.

We first notice Numbers 11. We learn here that the Lord designed to provide food for his people other than flesh-meats. He gave them manna, the "corn of heaven," and it was for their best good to be satisfied with it; but they were not. "They fell a lusting," and "wept" and said, "Who shall give us flesh to eat?" "Our soul is dried away; there is nothing at all, beside this manna, before our eyes." Moses was displeased with them. God was provoked at their course, but told Moses that they should have flesh to eat, even for a month, till it became disgusting to them. Moses could hardly believe this himself; but the Lord fulfilled his word by causing an immense number of quails to fly through the camp about three feet from the ground, and the people killed great quantities of them, till those that had the least had ten homers apiece. This seems almost incredible, when we consider the amount. But the record says: "While the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the people," and vast numbers perished. The Lord wanted them to be satisfied with the food he gave them, but they were not, and he gave them their desire; but it was in wrath, and they suffered because of it.

Another instance is recorded in Numbers, chapters 13 and 14. God designed that the children of Israel, after seeing his mighty works in Egypt, and receiving instruction at Sinai and sufficient discipline in the wilderness, should go at once into the land of Canaan. It seems he had promised them this, though of course the condition of faithfulness and obedience is always to be understood. When they came to the borders of Canaan, twelve spies were sent to see the condition and fruitfulness of the land, its inhabitants, walled cities, etc. They viewed it, and returned, bringing with them of its marvelous fruits. Ten of these men told falsehoods about it, and weakened the faith of the people by saying they could not conquer it. Two of them, Caleb and Joshua, gave a good report, and said, "Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it." But the others said, No; "let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt." They would not go up, as the Lord wanted them to do. God took them at their word, and said, "As truly as I live, as ye have spoken in my ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness; and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against me, doubtless ye shall not come into the land concerning *which I sware to make you dwell therein*, save Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun." "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years, *and ye shall know my breach of promise.*" Chap. 14:28–34. It seems that the Lord does change his course toward individuals when they manifest disobedience and murmurings toward him, and lets them have their own way, even when he had made the most solemn promises to them. Conditions must always be understood in connection with God's promises.

Another instance we notice in 1 Sam. 8, where the children of Israel wanted a king. God and his prophet were both displeased with this desire on the part of the people. The Lord said concerning their proposal, "They have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." He told Samuel to "protest solemnly unto them," and show them the evils which would result from such a course, showing them that it would be far worse for them than it had been under his arrangement; but they still persisted in their purpose to have a king, and God let them have their desire. He directed his servant to select and anoint a king for them, and Saul was chosen by the prophet of the Lord; yet the very evils which God had foretold, did follow, and their kings were a cause of many of their calamities at last, and it was far worse for them than if they had cheerfully accepted the Lord's plan.

Another instance where this principle is apparent is in the case of divorces. Matt. 19. The Lord through Moses had given a law in Deut. 24:1, permitting the people to put away their wives for various causes. When the matter was referred to Christ, he said, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." Then he lays down the original principle, that there was only one proper, rightful cause for divorces, which was adultery; and that those who procured them from other causes were guilty of sin. This was God's original plan; yet he permitted another course, because of the "hardness of the people's hearts." But there is no question but the original plan would have been better, had they been willing to follow it, and that they brought grave evils upon themselves by not doing so. Yet the prophet of the Lord gave them such permission, no doubt by divine consent.

This astute Marion editor might better study his Bible a little more, and be a little more candid, and he will find that God has "modified his directions," and has "lowered his standard," in some instances, to "suit people's ways." Here are four instances in which God has changed his course, because the people were not willing to take that course which would have been best for them; and no doubt many others could be mentioned. God, in his infinite love for man, and desire to save him, accommodates his ways to him in matters of lesser moment, and does the best he can for him under all the circumstances, rather than to lose his hold on man altogether. His standard of purity and right is ever the same, but in matters like eating, drinking, and dressing, having one form of government or another, or even in the greater matter of divorces, he has permitted that to be done which was not really for their best good, rather than force the people to do that which they were wholly unwilling to do. This we have proved beyond successful contradiction.

And here is a principle which is precisely analogous to that on which the charge in the dress question is based. There is no question in my mind but that if our people had cheerfully accepted the reform dress in the spirit in which it was given, had worn it without murmurings and fault-finding, and had taken a reasonable, sensible course concerning it, we should be far better off to-day for so doing. Many of our young people who have gone over to the world would have been saved from such temptation. We should not see among us such violations of the Bible teaching on the subject of dress as we now do. It would have been better for us in many ways. Yet taking the situation as it was, with all the bitter complainings and murmurings about the dress which were going, and with a set of extremists and narrow-minded ones who were making it their test of religious character, and forcing it upon the unwilling, we think it was far better to treat it as we did. It took more effort to keep our people in a right state of mind concerning it than we could afford for the benefit to be obtained from it.

The dress question should never be exalted to an equality with the great moral questions of the Bible, such as keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Meekness, humility, charity, goodness, patience, and other Christian graces, are ever more important than the cut of the clothes we wear, or the eating of certain kinds of food. We should give those subjects just the place God gives them in his word; and if we will notice closely, we shall soon discern that that place is not near so prominent as that which he gives to the great moral principles of his law, and the teachings of Christ. We claim that Sister White in her teachings has ever taken this position.

And in conclusion we inquire, What is there in all this question of the short dress which proves the Lord has never given special light through visions to Sister White? We fail to find any such evidence. All that we can see in it is simply this: At one time Sister White taught that it would be well, health-wise and spiritually, for our sisters to wear a certain form of dress because of certain reasons. But after a new class of circumstances had developed, because of the utter unwillingness of many of our people to adopt it, and opposition and complainings on the right hand and on the left, she ceased to urge it upon any, let all act their own pleasure in the premises, and set before them for their acceptance a dress more in conformity with those commonly worn, but plain and unobjectionable. What is there in all this so bad or so provocative of unbelief? For our part, we fail to see anything of the sort. Every reason which could be brought against her for doing in this matter as she has, can be brought against God's servants in other days, and even God himself, as we have plainly shown. The Bible contains many instances where the Lord has thus, in minor matters, permitted his people to take their choice, though his way would have been better for them, and though they reaped results from it which were not for their good. Brethren and sisters, let us be reasonable; let us be candid; let us put away our fault-finding and our unbelief, and treat the work of his Spirit with respect.

Eld. E. P. Daniel's Reply.

IN the *Advocate Extra*, Prof. Mc Learn tells a little story which he claims to have heard from a "prominent minister in the cars," to the effect that Mrs. White met Eld. E. P. Daniels, and said, "Bro. Daniels, I have a Testimony for you. The Lord has shown me that you said things, and acted in a manner, unbecoming a Christian minister, when you preached in Parma, Mich.;" and that Bro. Daniels replied, "You must be mistaken; for I never preached in Parma in my life." This, of course, is a very nice little story for our opposers to use; and they have a great fondness for such, and take no end of pains to circulate them. This is just about as true as many others they circulate. It is but justice to Bro. Daniels that he should have a chance to reply to it. The following from his pen is to the point. G. I. B.

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

The story is in circulation that at an audience granted me by Mrs White, I was informed by her that in a temperance lecture given by me in the village of Parma, I had used language unbecoming a Christian minister, and deported myself in a manner disgraceful to the pulpit, and that God had shown this to her in vision, all of which I then and there denied. This story I deny publicly, as I have several times already done in private. Mrs. White never told me that she had ever seen anything of this kind in vision, either about me or any one else. Through a misunderstanding, I happened to be the person rebuked, in the place of the one for whom the rebuke was intended, and who justly merited it. Were all the facts known, it would leave no room for even the slightest disrespect for the motives that influenced her, as she had, as she supposed, the best of reasons for believing that her informant had told her the truth. And indeed he had, but had made a mistake in the name of the person; all that she had said was true of another, though the incident did not occur at Parma. More than this, Mrs. White told me plainly that this report came from a gentleman whose acquaintance they had formed when traveling in the West.

Those who fight against Mrs. White and spiritual gifts would do well to forge their weapons of something more substantial than flying reports.

E. P. DANIELS,
Rankin Post Office,
Genesee Co., Mich.

July 25, 1883.

An Explanation.

BY ELD. U. SMITH.

As my name is quite freely used in the "Extra" to which this Supplement has reference, a word may be expected from me in regard to it. I am not at all solicitous to say anything on the ground that I have given any occasion for the use which is made of my name in the above-mentioned sheet; for I feel well assured that I have not.

I have always maintained the doctrine of the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, theoretically. I have believed, and do still believe, that the visions of Sister White are a practical illustration of that doctrine. But I have not believed, as past volumes of the REVIEW will testify, that these, or any other manifestation of spiritual gifts, stood on a level with the Scriptures, or that they should be made a test of fellowship. I see as yet no occasion to change my views in any of these respects. When I do, I can announce it myself; and till then our opponents need not presume to speculate upon, nor interpret, my position for me.

On one point, however, I am solicitous to speak; and that is that I have no sympathy with the

spirit of bitterness and personality manifested in the publication above referred to. The charge that Sister White is knowingly dishonest, or a willful deceiver, no one who is acquainted with her is ever going to believe. To denounce her work as the great "deception of the enemy of all righteousness," of "devilish" and "satanic" origin, is preposterous and inexcusable. Our friends must show, both in their feelings and utterances, a little more of the spirit of Christ, before they can expect to have much influence with the better class of believers,—a little more of that charity which the apostle sets forth as more desirable than all spiritual gifts, and without which the best gifts are but as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.

The foregoing was written before I knew a word of the matter which was to compose this Supplement.

The Visions:

HOW THEY ARE HELD AMONG S. D. ADVENTISTS.

BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER.

"QUENCH not the Spirit. *Despise not prophesyings.* Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. 5:19–21. This scripture is specially applicable to the last days, as the connection unmistakably shows. The apostle had been speaking of the "Lord descending with a shout," the "dead in Christ" rising first, the living being caught up together with them to "meet the Lord in the air." He tells us that when these things are about to transpire, an unbelieving world will be saying, "Peace and safety," and will be overtaken "as a thief." "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief," etc. Then certain practical instructions are given, which are specially important at this time, and then the words of this text occur. How applicable the words, "Quench not the Spirit," to this age when the "form of godliness prevails," and the "power thereof" is lacking; when the mass of professors of religion know nothing by experimental knowledge of the influence of the Spirit on their hearts; and denominations of Christians, so-called, can be found who teach that there is no Spirit in the world to affect the hearts of men, save in the "word alone"?

"Prophesyings" Mr. Webster defines to be "the exercise of the gift of prophecy." "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream." Num. 12:6. When the Spirit of God takes complete possession of a person's mind in his waking hours, and reveals that which he could not know by means of the ordinary mental processes of thought and experience, it is a vision; when this is done in the sleeping hours, as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar and others, it is a dream. Visions were common in those days when God's Spirit was with his people, and through them light has been given to the world. Much of the Bible was given through vision. Abraham had visions. Gen. 15:1. The word of the Lord came through vision. 2 Sam. 7:4, 11; Ps. 89:19. The light the prophets received, which enabled them to give us a knowledge of divine things, came the same way. Isa. 1:1; Eze. 1:1; Dan. 1:17; Nahum 1:1.

The Lord used the same method of giving light in the new dispensation. Luke 1:22; Acts 10:3, 10, 17; 2 Cor. 12:1, 7; Rev. 9:17. Indeed, this has been the ordinary, if not the exclusive manner by which God has imparted special light to mankind, and in ancient times it was thought to be a great calamity to be deprived of this precious blessing. Prov. 29:18; 1 Sam. 3:1; Micah 3:6.

But now we have reached a different age, when prophesyings are despised. There is nothing now that will bring a stare of astonishment, a sneer, and a curl of the lip, and cause one to be more the object of contempt, than to know that he believes that the Lord is again honoring his people with visions. It is just such an age as makes especially forcible and important the apostle's caution, "Despise not *prophesyings.*" "The exercise of the gift of prophecy" can be nothing else than having visions from the Lord; for "if there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision," saith the Lord.

The last or "remnant" church are to have this gift. Rev. 12:17. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev. 19:10. The spirit of prophecy is that manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit which enables one to prophesy, or if you please, have visions; for if there is a prophet among God's people, he will reveal himself through visions. Be it known to every reader of this Supplement, yea, to all who care to know it, that S. D. Adventists, as a body, firmly believe that there has been connected with this people, through their whole history, *one who has visions from the Lord.* If this be a disgrace, let our enemies make the most of it. We feel that it is a high honor. We would not deny it if we could, and we could not if we would. It has been recognized by the General Conference of our people, the highest authority among us, in resolutions many and strong, and the same has been done over and over in all our State Conferences which have been organized any length of time. We have been despised by many for this, and have had opprobrium and derision heaped upon us because of it. Misrepresentation and lies have been poured upon us for this reason; but we understand it all very well. We are living in an age when the people "despise prophesyings;" but we propose to heed the apostolic caution to despise them not, but to accept those which give satisfactory evidence of genuineness, as a distinguished honor from God.

We shall not here enter into an argument on the perpetuity of spiritual gifts. Our people are so familiar with it that it is wholly unnecessary to do so. The argument is so plain that even our enemies do not often undertake to deny its correctness. The gifts of the Spirit are promised to the church of God till the end of the dispensation; and one of these gifts is prophesying (1 Cor. 12:10, 28), or, if you please, having visions. And this gift, we have seen, is to be in the last church, among those who keep the commandments of God. We hope all will read again the article from Eld. Littlejohn, recently published in the REVIEW, which settles that point beyond successful contradiction. Either this gift is among us, or we are not the "remnant" church spoken of in the last verse of Rev. 12. If that church has not yet appeared, then we have not reached the last generation of men, and the coming of the Lord is not very near. The question, therefore, becomes to us one of vital interest, and it is no wonder our enemies are making such furious efforts to break down faith in this gift. They are sharp enough to see how much depends upon this position. This also accounts for the well-known fact that when persons have wholly lost faith in the manifestation of this gift among us, they have very soon lost their faith in other special subjects, such as the messages, the sanctuary, the work of the two-horned beast, and other views held by us. Our position on the Testimonies is like the key-stone to the arch. Take that out, and there is no logical stopping-place till all the special truths of the message are gone. Our enemies, and the master they serve, realize this; but some of our people are so blind that they do not. But some of us do, having seen these things developed over and over again during the history of this work.

We firmly believe the visions of Mrs. White are a genuine manifestation of spiritual gifts. They bear every test the Bible gives to distinguish between true and spurious manifestations. They speak according to the "law and the testimony." Isa. 8:20. Mahomet, Swedenborg, Ann Lee, Jo. Smith, and a host of spiritualists, do not thus speak. They proclaim that "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh" (1 John 4:1–3), and exalt him as man's Saviour, who died for our sins, and who now pleads his blood in our behalf; and declare him to be our only hope of salvation, and hence they "are of God." A host of spiritualist mediums do not, and hence we know they are not of God.

The fruits borne by these visions, are good, and hence the tree which bears them is good. Matt. 7:15–20. They teach truth and purity, and lead to the love of God, and the study of his word. Mahometanism, Mormonism, spiritualism, and a host besides which claim to be genuine manifestations, do not. We will not stop here to enter into the details of their history, but we know we speak the truth. The fruits of these visions are certainly manifest, after our experience with them of nearly forty years; and we unhesitatingly declare their fruits to be good. Every one who obeys them is made better by so doing. Not one immoral sentiment is taught by them. Our enemies, with all their bitterness, have never been able to show that they contain a single one. B. F. Snook, after he left us, and did his utmost against them, going from church to church in Iowa to break down confidence in them, when pressed by the question, "If a man will live out the 'Testimonies,' will he not be saved?" was compelled to answer that "he would." An admission from such an enemy, under such circumstances, carries with it strong weight in favor of their excellence.

We know very well that some *claim* that their fruits are not good, because they say divisions are caused by them, and those who are reproved by them sometimes give up the truth. We admit that these results sometimes follow. But the same argument would condemn even Christ himself. His reproofs caused some to be mad against him, and he said himself, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Matt. 10:34, 35. The truth of God ever causes a division between those who love it, and those who do not. The human heart never loves reproof; but the word teaches the necessity of it all the same. The trouble with the Testimonies is mainly because they are too straight for the carnal heart, and reprove selfishness, covetousness, and various sins, and show men to be wrong when they thought they were right. The human heart never likes this; and rather than yield their opinion, some will turn around to find fault with the reprover. This is no evidence that the Testimonies are wrong, and that their fruits are not good; but it is very strong proof of their heavenly origin.

The blessings to this cause from its connection with the visions, have been many and great. When this movement commenced in weakness and obscurity about thirty-five years ago, the Adventist body, about 50,000 strong, were making a stir in the world, and looked down upon this movement, and the visions connected with it, with contempt and derision. But how changed the circumstances! They have split up into sects, divisions, schisms, and factions; and none of them have enough coherence to keep up an effective organization. They are not really exerting one-tenth of the influence in the world at the present time that they were then. They have fallen to pieces almost like a rope of sand. This despised movement, with those much-hated visions in the forefront, has constantly gained strength, and has never before exerted the influence in the world that it is exerting at the present time. It is doing fifty-fold more to circulate the light of the precious truths connected with the Advent message than all the other Adventist bodies in our land put together.

It commenced in poverty and weakness, and was most unpopular with the world and the first-day Adventist believers themselves. It gathered of all classes and sects, and of different nationalities, and welded them together into one body, with a thorough organization. It is moving onward, increasing its extent and influence, and reaching out its arms to every civilized nation, till they almost encircle the globe. The light of the third angel's message is spreading as never before. Never were its prospects of ultimate success as bright as to-day.

To what do we owe this union and strength? We answer: To the influence of these despised visions more than to anything else but the word of God. They have always been held in high esteem by the most zealous and humble among our people. They have exerted a leading influence among us from the start. They have first called attention to every important move we have made in advance. Our publishing work, the health and temperance movement, the College, and the cause of advanced education, the missionary enterprise, and many other important points, have owed their efficiency largely to this influence. We have found in a

long, varied, and in some instances, sad experience, the value of their counsel. When we have heeded them, we have prospered; when we have slighted them, we have suffered a great loss. Many instances of this kind could be given from our past history. As a people, we have no reason to boast of our faithfulness to them. On the contrary, we have shown much of unbelief and indifference to their teachings. But when we have regarded them most highly, we have enjoyed the greatest prosperity. It is clear to every one who has closely noticed the workings of this cause that in those Conferences where these Testimones are most highly regarded, there the greatest degree of prosperity is seen; and in those where they are least respected, there the work drags heavily.

The same is true of individuals. We have never known a person to meet with much success in preaching this truth, who had little or no faith in the visions. And those ministers who are most successful in accomplishing real good, and truly build up the cause, are always those who have strong faith in them. And there is still another evidence in the individual experience of persons. We have had instances of ministers who for a period met with great success in their labors, and then finally lost a large part of that success, and seemed to accomplish very little. In every such case, success attended their labors when they had faith in the visions, and their lack of it came when they did not have such faith. These facts have become well known among us. All these things clearly prove them to be an essential part of the work itself.

The same lesson has been often taught by offshoots from our people, who made the visions a pretext for withdrawal from us. Bro. Waggoner has mentioned the old *Messenger* movement. Its leaders thought they could do great things if they could get rid of the visions; but they made a miserable failure. It was the same in Iowa. On my way to that important meeting at Pilot Grove, Ia., in 1865, after Snook and Brinkerhoff had withdrawn from the body, and had taken nearly one-third of the Sabbath-keepers of the State with them, I met Eld. Snook in Marion. He was full of fight, and was going to accomplish great things. He had his arguments all prepared against the visions. I said to him, "If you give up the visions, you will soon give up the messages, and other truths." "Oh, no," said he; "if we can get rid of the visions, we shall soon have the *loud cry* of the message. The visions are what stand in the way, and hinder the progress of the work." What was the result? In a short time, Elds. S. and B. had given up the messages, the sanctuary, the Sabbath, and all, and become Universalists. A little remnant there have been living out a lingering existence for seventeen years, and in their "Extra" just issued, the editor of the *Advocate* says, "It is more strange that we have been able to maintain our position, than that we have not built up a larger interest." Why, how is this? We thought if they could only get rid of those terrible visions, the truth would go wonderfully! Yet after trying it seventeen years, the editor is astonished that they have stood through the struggle at all; while we have been growing all the time, with this terrible "incubus," as they call the visions, and without them, they have hardly been able to maintain an existence, according to their own confession. They have the Sabbath truth, and the light on the state of the dead, and the Lord's coming, and other truths which the people accept most readily; but they make no progress.

Our S. D. Baptist brethren also greatly commiserate us because of the visions; yet they have a large amount of wealth, an educated and talented ministry, and stand as a very respectable people before the world, and are not disgraced by visions. How is it that they are practically making no advancement or increase with such great advantages? We leave them to answer. Well, we are thankful that with all our unworthiness, the Lord mercifully gives us light from heaven. We prosper when we follow it, for then God blesses us.

But it is said that we have lost many of our "leading ministers, such as B. F. Snook, W. H. Brinkerhoff, Moses Hull, M. E. Cornell," and they might have added, H. C. Blanchard, E. W. Shortridge, and others, because of the visions. Well, most of these did leave us, and with some, if not all, the visions were the pretext. We have no knowledge whatever but that Bro. Cornell is still in full faith a S. D. Adventist, but the rest have gone, our enemies say, because of the visions. Well, suppose that to be so, for the argument's sake; how much did they gain by doing so? These men were at one time laboring in the cause, and bringing souls to the truth, and seemed to be men who feared God and loved his truth. They became opposed to the visions, our opponents say, and for this reason left us. Moses Hull went into the blackness and darkness of atheism, and sank so low in filth that even the spiritualists will hardly own him. Elds. Snook and Brinkerhoff went over into Universalism, gave up the Sabbath of the Lord, and renounced the truth. H. C. Blanchard gave up preaching, and hardly kept the Sabbath the last we heard of him. Shortridge went into spiritualism and immortality, and others have also gone far from God and truth who have pursued the same course. Does giving up the visions seem to improve men spiritually, make them more devoted, give them more love for Christ and their fellowmen, lead them to be more conscientious and sacrificing,—more like Christ? These examples fail to show it. The truth is, there never was a case among us of a man who became more devoted by giving up the visions, but thousands have increased in devotion by accepting them, and will thank God for the light and spiritual strength they have received thereby.

We might increase these reflections to almost any length. Nothing is surer than this, that this message and the visions belong together, and stand or fall together. This has been the case from the commencement, and will be to the end. Thirty-five years of experience ought to teach us something. From the commencement, the visions have exerted a leading influence in the work in every important movement. It is folly to call this message the special work of God, and that leading influence which has molded it, the work of a deceiver or of the devil. God does not enter into such partnerships. I can easily see how a person who has no faith in the movement we are engaged in can cast aside the visions, but can see no reason or good sense in one's doing so who believes the message to be of God.

The majority of our people believe these visions to be a genuine manifestation of spiritual gifts, and as such to be entitled to respect. We do not hold them to be superior to the Bible, or in one sense equal to it. The Scriptures are our rule to test everything by, the visions as well as all other things. That rule, therefore, is of the highest authority; the standard is higher than the thing tested by it. If the Bible should show the visions were not in harmony with it, the Bible would stand, and the visions would be given up. This shows plainly that we hold the Bible the highest, our enemies to the contrary, notwithstanding. We believe them, because the Bible teaches that such manifestations will be seen in the last church, because every rule given in the Bible to test spiritual manifestations by proves them to be genuine, and because in all our experience we have found them to be of great value to us in every important point in our history. When we have Scripture and uniform experience in their favor, we have a strong case.

But when we have demonstrated them to be of God, then we claim that they should be respected, and their instruction should be regarded. We can see no consistency in persons' claiming to believe them of divine origin, and then paying no respect to their teaching. These instructions come to us in several different ways,—sometimes in books and pamphlets designed for general circulation, sometimes in special Testimonies designed for some particular church, sometimes privately to individuals. There are obvious reasons why this should be so. General instruction is needed, which all require. Sometimes there are local circumstances which it would not be proper to publish to the world, also personal reproofs for personal sins. All reasonable persons can see that there would be no propriety in making such things public.

Our enemies, in their desperate efforts to prove that we suppress the visions, try to make it appear that we do so because these special Testimonies to churches or individuals are not published everywhere. They show their lack of candor and their malice by so doing. They might just as well say that there was suppression, because every private letter was not published in the daily papers. Any reasonable person will admit that if the Lord gives special light to any one, that person is as likely to know how it should be communicated as those who do not have it, or those who hate it.

Our enemies try very hard to make it appear that we make the visions a test of fellowship. They must know themselves that this charge is false. Our leading men have never done this, and the visions themselves teach that it should not be done. It would be most absurd and impossible to do so, even if we would do it. With people in all parts of the world embracing our views who never saw Sister White or heard of her, how could we make them a test of fellowship? By their own admissions, our opponents have shown that we do not do so. They claim that there are many among us who do not believe the visions. This is true; yet these are in our churches, and are not disfellowshiped. They have claimed in this "Extra" that Elds. Smith, Canright, and Gage did not believe the visions; yet all of them are members of our churches, two of them hold credentials as ministers, and one of them holds very important offices. Why will men talk so foolishly and unreasonably as to even show they are not consistent in their own statements? Hatred blinds the mind, and destroys their good sense. No; we do not make the visions a test, and never have. But we do claim the right to believe them, to talk about them freely, and to read them in private and in public, and shall no doubt continue to exercise that right, regardless of the spite of those who hate us.

But we close this lengthy article. For our part, we thank God for light and truth in these last days, which comes from the throne above. We love and prize it, and hope it may ever continue to shine, till this dark world of sin is passed, and we enter the haven of rest.

Characteristics of the Visions.

THE following extract from the well-known book entitled, "Objections to the Visions Answered," sets before the reader in a forcible light some of the striking characteristics of this gift which has been among us from the commencement of the work. We commend it to the careful consideration of every one who is interested in the subject. G. I. B.

"Every test which can be brought to bear upon such manifestations, proves these genuine. The evidence which supports them, internal and external, is conclusive. They agree with the word of God, and with themselves. They are given, unless those best qualified to judge are invariably deceived, when the Spirit of God is especially present. They are free from the disgusting contortions and grimaces which attend the counterfeit manifestations of spiritualism. Calm, dignified, impressive, they commend themselves to every beholder, as the very opposite of that which is false or fanatical. The instrument herself is above jugglery or deceit.

"The influence is not mesmeric; for this people, reprobating the use of that agency, studiously refuse to learn the principles of its application, or to have aught to do with its practical workings; besides, the hallucinations of a mesmerized subject embrace only such facts and scenes as previously exist in the mind of the mesmerizing power; but the visions take cognizance of persons and things, and bring to light facts, known, not only by no person present, but not even by the one through whom the visions are given.

"They are not the effect of disease; for no disease has ever yet been known to have the effect of repeatedly suspending the functions of the lungs, muscles, and every bodily sense, from fifteen to one hundred and eighty minutes, while, in obedience to some influence which evidently had supreme possession of the mind, and in obedience to that alone, the eyes would see, the lips speak, and the limbs move.

"Further: their fruit is such as to show that the source from which they spring is the opposite of evil.

"1. They tend to the purest morality. They discountenance every vice, and exhort to the practice of every virtue. They point out the perils through which we are to pass to the kingdom. They reveal the devices of Satan. They warn us against his snares. They have nipped in the bud scheme after scheme of fanaticism, which the enemy has tried to foist among us. They have exposed hidden iniquity, brought to light concealed wrongs, and laid bare the evil motives of the false-hearted. They have warded off dangers from the cause of truth upon every hand. They have aroused and re-aroused us to

greater consecration to God, more zealous efforts for holiness of heart, and greater diligence in the cause and service of our Master.

"2. They lead us to Christ. Like the Bible, they set him forth as the only hope and only Saviour of mankind. They portray before us in living characters his holy life and his godly example, and with irresistible appeals they urge us to follow in his steps.

"3. They lead us to the Bible. They set forth that book as the inspired and unalterable word of God. They exhort us to take that word as the man of our counsel, and the rule of our faith and practice. And with a compelling power, they entreat us to study its pages long and diligently, and become familiar with its teaching; for it is to judge us in the last day.

"4. They have brought comfort and consolation to many hearts. They have strengthened the weak, encouraged the feeble, and raised up the despondent. They have brought order out of confusion, made crooked places straight, and thrown light on what was dark and obscure. And no person with an unprejudiced mind, can read their stirring appeals for a pure and lofty morality, their exaltation of God and the Saviour, their denunciations of every evil, and their exhortations to everything that is holy and of good report, without being compelled to say, 'These are not the words of one that hath a devil.'

"Negatively, they have never been known to counsel evil or devise wickedness. No instance can be found in which they have lowered the standard of morality. No one of their adherents has ever been led by them into paths of transgression and sin. They do not lead men to serve God less faithfully, or to love him less fervently. They do not lead to any of the works of the flesh, nor make less devoted and faithful Christians of those who believe them. In not a single instance can any of the charges here mentioned be sustained against them; and, concerning them, we may emphatically ask the question which Pilate put to the Jews in reference to the Saviour, 'Why, what evil hath he done?'

"Yet with all this array of good fruit which they are able to present, with all this innocency of any charge of evil that can be brought against them, they everywhere encounter the bitterest opposition They are the object of the blindest prejudice, the intensest hate, and most malignant bitterness. Worldlings and formal professors of all denominations, join in one general outcry against them of vituperation and abuse. Many will go a long distance out of their way for the purpose of giving them an uncalled-for and malicious thrust. And false-hearted brethren in our own ranks make them the butt of their first attacks, as they launch off into apostasy and rebellion. Why is all this? Whence all this war against that of which no evil can be said? From the example of Cain, who slew his brother; of the Jews, who clamored for the blood of the innocent Saviour; of the infidel, who storms with passion at the very name of Jesus; and from the princple of the carnal heart which is at enmity with everything that is holy and spiritual,—we leave the reader to answer.

"Some of those who so strenuously oppose the visions, have a series of objections which they offer in justification of their course. But before we look at these, let us for a moment survey the field, that we may, if possible, take in at a glance the cause, object, and aim, of this contest, and so be better prepared to put a just estimate upon the motives and efforts of the opposition. We believe, love, and defend the visions, on the grounds above set forth, their unvarying tendency to good, and because they so admirably answer the purpose for which the Scriptures assure us that the gifts were set in the church; namely, to comfort, encourage, and edify the saints, and bring them to the unity of the faith. On what ground can they be objected to? What is there in the fact that a person among Seventh-day Adventists, a sincere Christian, has visions, and has published them to the world, to excite all the stir and opposition that is everywhere raised over them? They do no hurt; what is the matter? They injure no one; then why not let the person enjoy her gift undisturbed, and those who choose to believe in it, believe in it in peace?

"But no! This work, innocent as it is of all evil, fruitful as it is of all good, must not be suffered to go on in peace. And again we ask, Why? We wish the reader carefully to consider this question. If we look at those who oppose this work, and consider the ground they occupy, we shall be able to define pretty accurately the motives from which they act. There are two classes which may be described, with the motives that govern them, as follows:—

"The first class is composed of those who believe, or did believe at the time their opposition commenced, the views held by Seventh-day Adventists, but in whom, or in some one with whom they sympathized, wrongs were pointed out and reproved by the visions. These same individuals had no doubt often prayed, 'Lord, show us our wrongs.' The Lord answers their prayers in his own way, and chooses to point them out in vision. Now, if they object to this, they show at once that there was no sincerity in their petitions; for they cannot sincerely wish to know their faults, if they are not willing to have them pointed out, except in a way of their own choosing. They should rather be grateful that they are made known to them in any manner, and that time and opportunity are given them to put them away before it is too late. But here too many rebel; and here comes in the first class of objectors to the visions. Not being dead to sin, they give way to the promptings of their still dominant carnal heart, and set to work, not to repent of their wrongs, which they cannot deny, but to break down that which has kindly, yet plainly, pointed out their wrongs, that they may see and put them away before the Judgment. They would prefer that the church should be without eyes, rather than that any of their wrongs should be seen and exposed.

"The other class consists of those who are the avowed and open opponents of all the distinguishing views held by Seventh-day Adventists. Their opposition springs from a different motive than that of the first class. Not having been reproved themselves by the visions, they have no ground for opposition in this respect; but they hate that system of truth with which the visions stand connected, and they attack the visions as the most sure and effectual way of hindering the progress of that truth. In this they acknowledge the efficiency of the visions in advancing this work. They know them to be one of the great elements of its strength and prosperity. And do they not, by such a course, plainly tell us, who love the truth, how we should regard the visions? If the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light, so the opponents of the truth are wiser than some of its professed friends. The old adage, 'It is lawful to learn even from an enemy,' may be put in practice by us here. If those who would gladly see this work come to naught, attack the visions as the most effectual way of accomplishing this, should not those who desire the work to advance and prosper be equally zealous in loving, living out, and defending the visions, as one of the most effectual means of securing this result? Consistency forbids that they should be esteemed of less importance by their friends than by their foes.

"This covers the whole ground of the opposition; for we have never known any objection to arise which could not be traced to one or the other of these two sources. The opposer is always a person who has either been reproved for wrongs himself, or is in sympathy with those who have been so reproved, or he is a person who is openly hostile to the positions of S. D. Adventists as a whole. But neither of these positions is, in our mind, very well calculated to enlist the sympathy of any sincere lover of honesty and uprightness, or any true friend of the cause."

My Position Defined.

BY W. C. GAGE.

A FREE use of my name in the "Extra" having been made by those whose evident *animus* is hostility to the cause with which I have been so long connected, perhaps a few words from me may not be amiss, in regard to my present position. I have for twenty years been a Seventh-day Adventist, holding all the cardinal points of doctrine peculiar to the denomination, in union and harmony with my brethren. Notwithstanding the unpleasant circumstances which have called forth this discussion, *this is still my position*, and I most decidedly object to being "read out of the denomination" by those who are its outspoken enemies. While there are difficulties in the Testimonies which I cannot explain, and while I cannot pronounce upon them with all that positiveness which characterizes the position of some of my brethren, my views as to the perpetuity of spiritual gifts have undergone no change, and I look upon the visions of Sister White, to some of which I have been a witness, as an exemplification of that doctrine. The apparent conflict between myself and some others in the matter of the College difficulty was not on the ground of the acceptance of the Testimony, but on its interpretation, and here, as a fallible individual, I am as likely to err as any one else.

And now, in conclusion, I wish my friends to know that I am a Seventh-day Adventist, having no sympathy with any factious opposition which would fain overthrow the pillars of truth. When I cease to be such, I would like the privilege of stating my own position, rather than to have it defined for me by those whose extreme animosity betrays their anxiety to bring about the destruction of this cause.

Testimonies, Public and Private.

WE will speak briefly concerning an objection which our opponents most unreasonably urge against the Testimonies. Because Mrs. White does not publish to the world portions of them which relate to private persons, but omits them in the printed Testimonies designed for public circulation, therefore her visions are uninspired. Was ever a more foolish objection heard of than this? Her visions are of three general classes: 1. Those which are of general interest to all; 2. Those for certain local churches; and 3. Those for private persons. Those of the first class are published for general circulation, and are obtainable by all who want them. Those for certain local churches, containing references of a personal character, are sent to those churches in full, for their instruction and encouragement. There are often portions of them containing instruction of general interest. These portions are sometimes published in the printed Testimonies, with the personal passages left out, and the persons' names omitted. So of personal Testimonies to individuals. Portions of these which contain general principles which would be applicable to many others, are published with the name blank.

And what, forsooth, is there in all this that shows that the Testimonies are not of God? If these personal passages were published to the world, names and all, the Brinkerhoffs, Mc Learns, Longs, et al., would be the first to shout themselves hoarse about the awful crime of publishing persons' private faults to the world, and they would then have some ground for their objections.

If God gives special light to a servant of his for the benefit of other parties, as he has done in ages past, I wonder if the one receiving it has not as good a right to judge how it should be managed and published, as any other person who has not received it, or as a class of bitter, partisan, unreasonable opponents have? Do these men think our people are such fools that they cannot see through their motives in acting as they do? We should greatly pity their intelligence if they could not.

Be it known unto all men that S. D. Adventists have more sense of propriety, and more regard for the feelings of private persons, than to publish their names and peculiarities broadcast to the world, to please our bitterest opponents. G. I. B.

Unreliable.

WE commend the statements of Brn. Smith and Gage in this Supplement to the attention of those, who, by a process of sophistical reasoning and misleading statements, have tried to make it appear that they have given up the Testimonies. The reckless and desperate character of the opposition is clearly shown in this issue, and especially by their pretended statements of facts. The answer of these brethren, and that of Bro. Daniels, makes this very evident. Statement after statement is made in the "*Advocate Extra*" which is utterly unreliable. There are so many of these, we do not pretend to follow them severally with a denial; but would advise all who have read them to wait for confirmatory evidence before believing them.

G. I. B.

Seventh-Day Adventists and the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

BY ELD. W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

IN the twelfth chapter of Revelation is found a symbolic prophecy, covering the whole period lying between the first and the second advent. In it the church is represented as a woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and wearing upon her head a crown of twelve stars. A great red dragon with seven heads and ten horns makes war upon the woman, and continues his persecution for 1260 prophetic days, or 1260 literal years. It is generally conceded by commentators that this dragon symbolized the Roman government controlled by Satan. Commencing the 1260 years, during which the church was to be in the wilderness state, in A. D. 538, one of the earliest dates assigned for the rise of the papacy, they would end in 1798. Just before the expiration of the time, the earth is represented as helping the woman, *i. e.*, the church. This is understood as applying to the great change which took place in the sixteenth century in public sentiment, which resulted so favorably to the church that the kings of the earth intervened in her behalf, and turned back the tide of papal persecution which had set in against her so long.

It appears, nevertheless, from the record, that there is to be a revival of the persecuting spirit in the close of time, and that Satan is once more to make war effectually upon the people of God. Here is the prediction: "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

It is manifest from the foregoing that the war upon the saints spoken of must take place this side of the termination of the 1260 years, or this side of 1798. It is also demonstrable that when it once

breaks out, it will continue until the close of time. This can be proved in various ways. First, the war is to be with the remnant of the seed of the church. But the remnant means the last end of anything. The last of the church, therefore, must include the last generation of Christians, or those who are to endure this persecution. Secondly, in Revelation, chapters 13 and 14, this same conflict between Satan and the people of God in the last days is more elaborately set forth. In those chapters it is made clear that the contest will continue until the coming of the Lord, since the penalty denounced upon those who carry on the persecution is the seven last plagues (Rev. 14:9–12); but these plagues just antedate the coming of Christ, and could with propriety, therefore, be threatened against those only who are living and carrying on such a persecution at the time when they are poured out (chapter 16), *i. e.*, just previous to the advent.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

Up to this point the object has been to give to the reader in the briefest manner possible a chronological view of the prophetic history of the church, for the purpose of showing that having passed the long period covered by the 1260 years of persecution beginning in A. D. 538 and ending in A. D. 1798, we have now reached a point where it is possible for the church to enter at any time upon that period of suffering which is just to precede the second advent of Christ. Hoping that we have not been so brief in our treatment of the subject that the points made have escaped the perception of the reader, the real object of this article will now be brought out, *i. e.*, the identification of the people spoken of in the prophecy as the remnant of the church. Be it known, therefore, that S. D. Adventists claim to be the ones whom John saw in vision, and whom he styled the "remnant who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Arising, as they did, in 1846, they appeared sufficiently late in the history of the world to meet the requirement of the prophetic prediction, since forty-eight years intervened between 1798 and the time of their rise.

As it regards the two prominent points of the faith of the remnant church spoken of by John, it is well known that S. D. Adventists claim to hold and practice both of them. These points are, first, the keeping of the commandments of God, and, secondly, the having or possessing of the testimony of Jesus Christ.

Concerning the first point, it may be remarked that, to say the least, those who keep the commandments of God in this dispensation must be those who observe the decalogue, since the ten commandments are pre-eminently such at the present time in contradistinction from those precepts of the New Testament which originated with the Lord Jesus Christ. The ten commandments were written with the finger of God, and spoken with the voice of God. These commandments are a summary of all moral obligation; and were observed and enforced by Christ in the most impressive manner. Matt. 5:17–19. To keep these commandments demands that they should be observed in their completeness by those so doing. In other words, no one can be said to be a commandment-keeper in the Scripture sense of the term who, while observing nine, deliberately violates the tenth commandment. James 2:8–12. Applying this principle to S. D. Adventists, it is observable that they comply with the conditions which it demands, not only theoretically but also practically. While the orthodox world nominally keep the commandments of God, they habitually break the fourth by substituting the first day as a Sabbath in the place of the seventh day, which is the only one that God has ever commanded us to hallow as such. Ex. 20:8–12. S. D. Adventists, on the contrary, are as careful in their observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, which is enforced by the fourth commandment, as they are strict in their obedience to any one of the remaining nine commandments. Such being the case, it is manifest that they can properly be called commandment-keepers.

Respecting the second point of faith to be held by the remnant church, *i. e.*, "the testimony of Jesus Christ," it may be remarked right here that S. D. Adventists claim to be in possession of this also. Having seen that they have arisen at the right time, that they claim to be the people designated in the prophecy, and that, remarkable as it may seem, they in common with other Sabbatarians are the only persons who can properly be said to keep the commandments of God, they should at least so far command our respect as to secure from us a candid hearing of what they have to say in the matter of proving that they have the testimony of Jesus Christ, and consequently are in possession of the second point of faith necessary to their identification with the remnant church. Their line of argument is brief and straightforward.

Allowing the Scriptures to interpret themselves, they refer us to Rev. 19:10 for an inspired interpretation of the testimony of Jesus Christ. In the last clause of that verse we find these words: "Worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This, say they, is explicit. It defines the testimony of Jesus to be the spirit of prophecy in a manner so unequivocal that it leaves no room for discussion respecting the matter, so far as its use is concerned in the book of Revelation to say the least.

Having demonstrated that the remnant church are, therefore, to have the spirit of prophecy, they at once proceed to make out their claim to the honor of being the remnant church by pointing to one who, since the rise of their denomination, has actually exercised the prophetic gift among them. In this gift they have the utmost confidence, proving from the Scriptures that it bears every test which has been placed in the sacred word for the purpose of determining the genuineness of such manifestations. Strangely enough, therefore, they are able to show that, in the matter of the time of their rise and the peculiar points of their faith, they answer to the prophetic people whom John saw emerging into sight just before the coming of Christ. Would it not be a little remarkable if a spurious work, so nearly resembling the genuine, were allowed to appear in the providence of God, connected with which are found the characteristic features in the time of rise and points of faith that were to mark the remnant church?

Do you ask how the claims of this people are generally met by the Christian world? The answer is, In various ways. Frequently they are subjected to ridicule. Respecting this feature of the opposition to their work, we need only say that ridicule is very rarely employed by those who have a good cause. Straightforward argument is so much more satisfactory that those who have it generally use the same.

THE SABBATH.

Passing to the case of those who make a show of argument in opposing S. D. Adventists, it may be said that in the matter of the Sabbath their efforts are characterized by manifest weakness. Claiming to observe the Sunday because God has made it the Sabbath in the place of the seventh day, they are confessedly unable to find a "thus saith the Lord" for the change. The fatality of such a want of Scriptural authority for the change of the Sabbath is observable to the thoughtful at a glance. That God should have given a Sabbath law to the race, which it is generally admitted enforced the observance of the seventh day for fifteen hundred years, and then substituted another day without saying so to any one, and without even altering the original law, which remained still in force, is too absurd to be dignified with the name "argument." In this controversy, therefore, S. D. Adventists have greatly the advantage; since in making out their claim they have only to demonstrate that God said what he meant and meant what he said.

SPIRIT OF PROPHECY.

In their opposition to that feature of the S. D. Adventist faith which relates to the "spirit of prophecy," the antagonists of that denomination follow different lines of attack. Some argue that spiritual gifts as known among S. D. Adventists are not genuine; others argue that spiritual gifts ceased in the days of the apostles altogether. To those who reject as spurious the manifestations of spiritual gifts believed in by S. D. Adventists, the latter reply that the objections are not well founded, challenging them to a single Bible test which, when applied to the phenomenon which they claim to be the spirit of prophecy, will in any way invalidate that claim. Thirty-six years of writing and speaking and teaching, say they, are sufficiently long to furnish the material for the impeachment of this manifestation if it be not genuine.

This challenge, though oft repeated and oft accepted, leaves the people making it more firmly established in their convictions on the subject of spiritual gifts than they were when first they embraced them. To those who deny that miraculous powers were designed to continue in the Christian church throughout the dispensation, they present a Bible argument which is literally invulnerable. This argument is varied in its character. In the first place, they show that the gifts were "set in the church," and that they have never been withdrawn therefrom, so far as the record is concerned. 1 Cor. 12. In the second place, they demonstrate that the gifts, having been given for the work of the ministry, the perfecting of the saints, etc. (Eph. 4:8, 11, 13), are presumably to be enjoyed at the present time, since they are just as necessary to the perfecting of the saints and the work of the ministry now as they ever were. In the third place, they bring forward a large number of texts which positively teach that it was the original design of Christ that miraculous powers should continue in the church in all ages. In the fourth place, they cite Rev. 12:17 to prove that the last generation of Christians are to have the spirit of prophecy, or that which is the same, the testimony of Jesus Christ.

To the first, second, and third propositions, but little can be said in reply. It must be admitted by all that there is no positive statement that the gifts were to cease during the Christian age. It is also obvious that the necessity for them is as great as it ever was. Again, the candid reader will find in the following twelve texts usually cited by them in favor of the perpetuity of the gifts, a series of passages so direct in their statements that it is impossible to avoid seeing the conclusion to which they all point: John 14:12–14; Mark 16:15–18; Acts 2:14–21; 2:37–40; 1 Thess. 5:19–21; 1 Cor. 12; 14:1–39; 13:8–12; 1:4–8; James 5:14–16; Rev. 1:1, 3; 12:17.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS.

To the fourth conclusion, greater exception is taken. The reason is obvious. Concede the point that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, and the opponents of S. D. Adventists can make but little head against them. Arising, as they did, at the right time, keeping, as they do, the commandments of God while claiming to have the spirit of prophecy, there is a strong presumption in their favor, provided it be true that the testimony of Jesus attributed to the remnant church is indeed the spirit of prophecy.

To avoid the necessary conclusion, therefore, which otherwise would follow, the objector insists that Rev. 19:10 does not prove that the testimony of Jesus Christ, though called the "spirit of prophecy," is the same as the gift of prophecy. In the original, says he, the article is employed, making the passage read as follows: "Worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy." In other words, he continues, the testimony of Jesus is declared to be the spirit of *this* prophecy, *i. e.*, the spirit of the prophecy of the book of Revelation. Whether such an objection is entitled to be called ingenuous, is a matter of debate. It is quite certain, nevertheless, that it is not well taken in fact.

In the first place, it is difficult to see how, were the article present in the original, it could be so readily changed in its translation from *the* to *this*, since there is a wide difference in the signification of these two words; so wide, indeed, that had the apostle intended to imply an idea which would have been properly expressed in the use of the word *this* he would naturally have employed the pronoun ὄντος, so familiar to the Greek scholar anciently.* Failing to do so (in the absence of proof to the contrary), it is to be inferred that John's use

* A friend very kindly furnishes me with the facts contained in this note, and the one in which reference is made to the rules in several Greek grammars relating to the article and its use in connection with abstract nouns.

of the article instead of the pronoun was the result of deliberate choice, and can be accounted for only on the ground that the idea which would have been conveyed by the word *this* was not in his mind.

In the second place, it may be remarked here that the presence of the article in the original by no means proves that it had any special significance; as it is well understood that the Greeks were wonderfully prodigal in the use of the articles, employing or rejecting them as each writer might think that the laws of euphony, or sound, might require. Furthermore, even where the article seems to have been necessary in the Greek idiom in order to meet the requirement of taste according to Greek ideas, it is so far from having any point or force in an English translation, that it would not only be cumbersome in such a translation, but would also be decidedly objectionable. In proof of this, the following texts will furnish a few out of hundreds of instances in which in the King James's version the article, though found in the original, is not translated at all:—

GREEK ARTICLES NOT TRANSLATED.

[Heb. 2: 9,—2†]	[Heb. 3: 13,—2]
[Heb. 4: 11,—2]	[Heb. 4: 16,—1]
[Heb. 9: 27,—1]	[Matt. 10: 16,—2]
[Matt. 19: 1,—5]	[Mark 1: 26,—1]
[Mark 12: 43,—2]	[Mark 3: 15,—2]
[John 11: 4,—4]	[John 3: 2,—2]
Rom. 5: 12,—4]	[Rom. 5: 3, 4,—4]
[Rev. 2: 10,—3]	[Rom. 12: 21,—3]
[Rev. 20: 14,—5]	[Rev. 2: 24,—2]

That the last article in the final clause of Rev. 19: 10 is also of this class and was properly omitted in our accepted version, is rendered more than probable by the circumstance that the fifty-two modern scholars who had the New Version translation in charge, have, like the translators of the King James's version, neglected to translate the article altogether. Here is their rendering: "Worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." From the foregoing it will be noticed that the two versions in question are the same ~~word for word.~~ I know not how much the subjoined list might be swelled, were the necessary effort put forth, but those which are given are sufficient in number to show that there is no significance in the article in the last clause of Rev. 19: 10, else it would have been translated (which it is not) in the following renderings; viz., the Syriac New Testament translated by Murdock; Sawyer's Translation of the New Testament; the American Bible Union New Testament; the New Testament Revised by Dean Alford; the Vulgate translation; Whiting's Translation of the New Testament; Wesley's Notes; Revised New Testament.‡

It is now time to look at the question from another point of view. Any translation which would make nonsense of the passage as a whole, assuredly is not worthy of acceptance. That the one in question would do so, is rendered certain by a moment's thought. To aid the reader in reaching this conclusion, it is desirable that his attention be called to one point; *i. e.*, the circumstance that in the first part of the 19th verse our King James's version does not present the thought as happily as it might. Spiritualists have cited that reading in the interests of their views, endeavoring to prove therefrom that the heavenly messenger at whose feet John fell for the purpose of offering him worship, was nothing more nor less than the spirit of one of the ancient prophets. This view is of course absurd, since angels and men belong to entirely different orders of beings. The original, when properly rendered, simply conveys the idea that the angel was the fellow-servant of John and of John's brethren the prophets, and therefore should not be worshiped by the former. The New Version is perspicuous in its presentation of the thought. Here it is: "See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren that hold the testimony of Jesus."

In the light of the foregoing, the task of determining the sense in which the term "testimony of Jesus" is employed in Rev. 19: 10, can no longer be a matter of doubt. Certain it is that it does not signify one thing in the first part of the verse and another thing in the last part of the verse. Recalling the fact now that it is claimed that in the latter part of the verse it means the spirit of this prophecy, or, in other words, the spirit of the book of Revelation, we inquire for the signification of the expression, and how it affects the question at issue. Is it replied that the passage thus rendered merely teaches that the "spirit of prophecy" means the understanding or signification of the prophecy contained in the book of Revelation? The answer is, If such is the signification of the "testimony of Jesus" (or that which is the same thing,—the spirit of prophecy), then it must be so understood in the fore part of the verse where it is also employed. But will such an understanding of the term in the first portion of the verse harmonize with the obvious sense of the passage? Let us see. As the terms "spirit of prophecy" and "testimony of Jesus" are represented by the angel as being synonymous, or meaning the same thing, it is admissible to interchange them. This done, the clause will read as follows in the New Version: "See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren that hold the signification of this prophecy."

The passage thus rendered represents the angel as telling John that he was a fellow-servant with him, and with his brethren who at the time in question held the signification or understood the meaning of the prophecy of the book of Revelation. But was such a declaration true to the facts in the case? The answer is necessarily in the negative; as at the time when these words were uttered, there was not a living soul who along with John understood the import or meaning of the prophecy contained in the book of Revelation. Because, in the first place, the prophecy itself was not yet complete, since subsequently to that point of time the subject matter contained in the balance of chapter 19 and chapters 20, 21, and 22, were yet to be revealed; secondly, it was impossible that John should have any brethren at that time who in common with him understood the meaning of the prophecy; for he himself was yet in vision, and could not, therefore, comprehend its import. Nay, more, it is manifestly true that even when he had passed out of the state of vision, the larger portion of the book of Revelation must have been entirely enigmatical to him, as it treated of events and nations still in the womb of a distant future. It has been reserved until modern times for men to make a right application of much of the book of Revelation, and, indeed, it is quite certain that there are still some portions of it which are not fully understood. But even were it all understood at the present time, that would not help the matter. Said the angel, "I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren that *hold* the testimony of Jesus." Mark it! He does not say with thy brethren that *are to hold; i. e.*, at some future time, but he says *that hold; i. e.*, that hold it *now*, or at this time. The verb is in the present tense, and applied to that which was taking place when John and the angel were talking together.

To recapitulate: If the testimony of Jesus in the latter part of the verse means an understanding of the book of Revelation, then it means the same thing in the first part of the verse, but this cannot be the case, since such a view would make nonsense of the passage, as it would represent the angel as telling John that he was the fellow-servant of him and of his brethren who at that time had an understanding of the prophecy contained in the book of Revelation; whereas, the fact is, that neither John nor any of his brethren at the time in question did understand the import of the prophecy of that book. Thus much for the *argumentum ad absurdum*, or the arguments by which the view under examination is shown to be false, because otherwise, it would lead to the absurd conclusion that an angel of God was guilty of dealing in nonsense.§

In the preceding numbers of this article, we have been considering an interpretation of Rev. 19: 10 which would make the phrase "spirit of prophecy" as used therein, tantamount to the expression "spirit of this prophecy." That interpretation has been demonstrated to be utterly untenable.

Now we come to the exposition of the passage presented by S. D. Adventists. It is this: First, consistency demands that we should understand the term "testimony of Jesus" as signifying the same in the latter as it does in the former portion of the passage. Secondly, the angel defines the "testimony of Jesus" in the latter portion of the passage as meaning the "spirit of prophecy." Thirdly, it must therefore mean the same as the spirit of prophecy in the first portion of the same verse. Fourthly, the spirit of prophecy is consequently the same as the gift of prophecy. Fifthly, reading the passage conformably to this understanding, it would run as follows: See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren that hold (have) the gift of prophecy; worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit (gift) of prophecy.

It will be observed that such an exposition is in harmony with the obvious meaning of the text. The meaning conveyed is neither difficult of comprehension nor contrary to the facts in the case. By it the angel is made to say to John, You must not worship me; I am not God; God is the only person who is worthy to be worshiped. I am simply your fellow-servant, and the fellow-servant of your brethren which have the gift of prophecy, or are prophets.

The declarations of the angel thus made are both pious and Scriptural,—pious, because they indicate the grand doctrine that not even an angel of God is to be worshiped, since adoration belongs only to Jehovah; Scriptural, because they are in accord with the testimony of all the scriptures bearing upon this subject. That is, the angel tells John that which the Bible teaches in a multitude of instances; namely, that the spirit of prophecy comes through the ministration of the angels of God; *i. e.*, that God employs these angelic beings in communicating to the prophets those things which he wishes to have revealed to his church. Rev. 1: 1, 3; Dan. 9: 20–23.

By way of corroborating the correctness of the exegesis presented above, many passages of Scripture might be introduced here; but space will only admit of the presentation of one. In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul expresses the great delight which he experienced on account of the prosperity of the church to whom his epistle was directed. That prosperity he attributes to the possession on their part of the gifts of the Spirit. Those gifts of the Spirit he referred to as being synonymous with the testimony of Jesus. Here are his words: "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ, that in everything ye are enriched by him in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you; so that ye come behind in no gift, waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Let the reader observe the language closely

In Rev. 22: 7, 9, 18, the demomstrative pronoun (*τούτου*) is used with the article (*τοῦ*,) to point out definitely what book is meant. For example, verse 7, "*τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου.*" The words of the prophecy of *this* book. In Rev. 22: 19 the demonstrative *ταυτης* is used with the article *τῆς* to point out definitely what prophecy, "*τῆς προφητείας ταύτης,*" "*This* prophecy."

†In the citations made above, the figure which follows the dash indicates the number of instances in which the article occurs in the preceding text, but is not translated. That the reader may see the impropriety of translating all of the articles in the original in an English version, the following literal translation of 2 Pet. 1: 5, 6, 7, is given:—

"And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith the virtue; and to the virtue the knowledge; and to the knowledge the temperance; and to the temperance the patience; and to the patience the godliness; and to the godliness the brotherly kindness; and to the brotherly kindness the love."

‡"The Greek uses the article in certain cases in which the English generally omits it. (*b.*) Abstract nouns very often take the article."—*Goodwin's Greek Grammar*, p. 200, Art. 141, Note 1.

"The 'Generic Article.' This must often be left untranslated in English . . . and generally so when applied to abstract nouns."—*Hadley's Greek Grammar*, p. 217, Art. 529.

From the above it will be seen that the translators of our version were justified in omitting the article, provided the word "prophecy" was used in the abstract sense.

§Another argument to prove that the "testimony of Jesus" cannot be restricted in its signification to the understanding of the book of Revelation might be drawn from the following consideration: The angel says that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. What will be true of one, consequently, will be true of the other. But the spirit, *i. e.*, meaning, of the book of Revelation did not exist until the book itself was written. It must be equally true, therefore, if the testimony of Jesus was the same as the spirit of prophecy, that the testimony of Jesus did not exist until the book of Revelation was brought into being; *i. e.*, A. D. 95. That such a proposition is absurd, however, is demonstrated when we call attention to the fact that Paul states that the Corinthian church had the testimony of Jesus Christ in A. D. 59; or thirty-six years before the book of Revelation was composed. 1 Cor. 1: 1–8.

The testimony of Jesus, Paul says, is confirmed in you, so that ye come behind in no gift. Here the possession of the testimony of Jesus is said to secure to them the gifts. That those gifts were the gifts of the Spirit is made certain by the language employed in the connection, since they are said to enrich the church "in all utterance and in all knowledge." Thus we are enabled to show that when we understand the angel as defining the testimony of Jesus to be the gift of prophecy, our exegesis is in harmony with the testimony of Paul.

Stepping outside of the Bible for a moment, it is possible to prove that Paul and John did not originate the theory that the testimony of Jesus is the same as the spirit of prophecy. The Talmud, which is made up of the Mishna and Gemara, or the laws handed down by tradition from Moses with comments thereupon by Jewish Doctors, furnishes frequent illustrations of the use of the term "spirit of prophecy," of such a character as to leave no doubt that they understood that it meant the gift of prophecy. In speaking of the sons of Zerah, the Targum says: "These were all chief men; and on them the spirit of prophecy rested." (See Clarke's notes on 1 Chron. 2:6.) Again, in speaking of the disciples of Jabez, mentioned in 1 Chron. 2:55, the Targum says that they were called "Sucathim, because they were overshadowed by the spirit of prophecy." (See Clarke's notes *in loco*.) Once more: of the epithets applied to Moses by Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, who rescued him from the Nile and brought him up, the Targum says that she "called him these names by the spirit of prophecy, for she became a proselyte." —*Idem*, 1 Chron. 4:18. Finally, in 1 Chron. 28:12, where, in speaking of the pattern of the temple given to David, it is said that it was given to him by the Spirit, the Targum has it "by the spirit of prophecy which was with him."—*Idem in loco*.

The foregoing citations settle the point that Jewish writers, in common with the apostles of Christ, were in the habit of using the phrase "spirit of prophecy," and applying the same to that inspiration from the Almighty which takes possession of the minds of men, enlightening and controlling them. It matters not for the purposes of this argument whether we locate the origin of the Targum during the Jewish captivity at Babylon, four hundred and fifty-seven years before Christ, or subsequently to the first advent. In either case the result is the same, since it would be absurd to argue that the Jews would have borrowed this term from the Christians, whom they hated with an inveteracy scarcely equaled. In other words, take whichever view you please, it is certain that the Targumists applied the term "spirit of prophecy" to the prophetic gift, because such an application was common among the Jews in their day, and no doubt had been made ages before this time. Such being the fact, then the term "spirit of prophecy" as employed by John in Rev. 19:10, was thus employed in that place by the Holy Spirit, because it was a term which had a well-defined meaning, which exactly expressed the idea Inspiration designed to convey when John had his vision in Patmos; namely, that the prophetic gift was identical with the testimony of Jesus, and that it was the office work of the holy angels under God to impart such gifts to men.

By two distinct routes, therefore, we are led to the conclusion that the angel meant to be understood as saying that the testimony of Jesus is in a general sense the same as the prophetic gift. The first of these lay along the line of the obvious sense of the passage. That is, it has been shown that to interpret the angel as teaching that the testimony of Jesus meant an understanding of the prophecy of the book of Revelation, would make nonsense of the whole passage, and bring us in conflict with the actual facts as they then existed, since it would render it necessary for us to admit that John and the prophets of this time understood the import of the book of Revelation, even before the book itself was fully revealed. The second line of argument runs parallel with the usage of the Jewish nation in the matter of language, showing that the standard authorities among the Hebrews employed the term "spirit of prophecy" uniformly in the sense of the "gift of prophecy" in the days of the apostles, and that when the Holy Spirit employed that phrase (there being no proof to the contrary) it was undeniably done with the expectation that it would be received in its commonly accepted and most obvious sense.

Thus, candid reader, we have given you in brief outline some of the more striking points of the faith of S. D. Adventists, and a few of the reasons *why* they believe that which they *do* believe. As you have accompanied us, you have been made aware that they claim to be the remnant people spoken of in Rev. 12:17 and Rev. 14:9–12. You have also been made aware that their claims to this identification rest upon the following facts:—

1. They have arisen at the right time; 2. They claim to be keeping the commandments of God; 3. They make good their claim by observing the fourth or Sabbath commandment as well as the rest of the commandments,—a thing which is not true of the orthodox world generally; 4. They have had in their midst the spirit of prophecy since the time of their rise, as is shown by the fact that the phenomenon which they claim to be such can be demonstrated to be genuine by the application to it of all the Scripture tests.

In the present article you have seen how one of the most ingenious efforts of the opponents of this gift to dispose of the same on the ground that the gift of prophecy is not alluded to in Rev. 19:10 and 12:17 under the term "testimony of Jesus," has been met and utterly overthrown. With equal ease all other objections commonly urged against the faith of S. D. Adventists can be successfully answered. If you would be satisfied that such is the case, we appeal to you to provide yourself with the publications of the denomination in question, for the purpose of giving them a careful and prayerful reading, and testing all their teachings by the word of God. If it is true that God is at the present time raising up a people who keep his commandments, while others are breaking them, and if it be true that he is speaking to that people through the gift of prophecy, assuredly it is desirable that you should be made acquainted with these facts.

A Few of the Epithets which Eld. McLearn applies to Sr. White and her Work.

TAKEN FROM THE "ADVOCATE" AND ITS "EXTRA."

"MRS. WHITE and her illiterate dupes."

"Her contradictory and childish effusions."

"What do the S. D. Adventist people mean by upholding a woman in such glaring inconsistences and blasphemous pretensions?"

"In her interpretation of that vision, she is dishonest."

"We have been imposed upon by Mrs. White and her backers."

"You cannot cover such crooked tracks as Mrs. White has made for you."

"In the name of common consistency, what do the S. D. Adventist people mean by accepting and covering up this work of deception?"

"You are educated to deceive by means of her blasphemous pretensions."

"Why will not the people arise in the majesty of their 'blood-bought rights,' and shake off this destructive incubus?"

"Her popish claims to infallibility."

"Mrs. White's tyrannical and unreasoning domination."

"The people upon whom she now foists her impositions."

"The glaring inconsistencies and palpable contradictions you see in Mrs. White's course."

"Heaven-insulting pretensions to the infallibility of Mrs. White's contradictory statements."

"Using the sacred name of Deity in connection with her soul-destroying deceptions."

The above citations from Eld. McLearn's pen have been grouped together, and printed, simply to show the nature of the spirit by which he is at present controlled. Such an outburst of malevolence would hardly be expected in his case. May God pity him.

G. W. A.

From the REVIEW of May 1, 1883.

To Whom It may Concern.

MY attention has been called to a tract written by J. S. Green, in which he seeks to convey the impression that Eld. James White appropriated to his own use and benefit a certain portion of the property which my husband assigned to him with the understanding that it should be used exclusively for the benefit of the cause.

I wish it distinctly understood that I have no sympathy with the writer of that tract in his attack upon Eld. White and wife, and that I am perfectly satisfied with the disposition which has been made of my husband's estate, believing, as I do, that it has been disposed of as nearly in harmony with the wish of my deceased husband as was possible under the circumstances.

The time was when, through a misapprehension of the facts in the case, I was led to do and say things which I very much regret at the present time. That which causes me the most pain is the circumstance that the name of my husband is employed to injure a cause which was dearer to him than his life, and to scandalize those whom he loved, and in whom he had the most implicit confidence.

So far as my personal interest in the estate of my husband is concerned, I wish to say that I have not the slightest cause for complaint, as I have been dealt with even more liberally by those who have managed his estate than was provided for by the terms of his will.

ADDIE P. HARVEY.

COMPANION TO THE REVISED VERSION

OF THE

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT,

EXPLAINING THE

Reasons for the Changes Made in the Revised Edition.

By ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D. D.,

Professor of Humanity, St. Andrew's, and Member of the New Testament Company.

With Explanations of the Appendix to the Revised New Testament, which contains the Changes Suggested by the American Committee, but which were not assented to by the English Committee. By a Member of the American Committee of Revision, who is well acquainted with all the facts, having been connected with the work from the beginning.

Dr. Chambers, of New York, says of this book: "Many persons have expressed a desire that simultaneously with the issue of the Revised New Testament, there should appear an authentic explanation of the reasons for such changes as will be found in its pages. The work of Dr. Roberts is exactly fitted to meet this desire. Under the heads of alterations due to a revised text, and those due to a new translation, the author furnishes a clear and perspicuous statement which will give to the English reader all the light on the subject which the case admits."

Paper, octavo size, *25c.* Cloth, 16mo. *75c.*

Address *REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.*,
Or, *PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.*

QUARTO, 838 PAGES. 285 ENGRAVINGS.

THE PICTORIAL CHILD'S BIBLE.

—BEING A—

Consecutive Arrangement of the Narrative and other portions of the Old and New Testaments, in the words of the Authorized Version,

Embellished with nearly 300 Fine Engravings and Maps.

This is a most beautiful book for children of all ages, and a very

Valuable Help to Primary Teachers of Sabbath-school Classes.

The text is in Great Primer type, and is printed on heavy, calendered paper, making a large and elegant volume, quarto size, of 838 pages.

While the Bible is a book for all, there are some parts of it which are as milk for babes, and some as strong meat for men. The publishers of the "Child's Bible" have endeavored to put in consecutive form such portions of the Holy Scriptures as seem best adapted to the wants and capacities of childhood, in the words of the Bible text. And where the sense requires it, words and clauses have been inserted in brackets, sometimes as summaries of what has been omitted, and sometimes as connecting links.

Believing that the youth should know at what cost the English Bible was won and preserved for them, there has been prefixed to this edition an account of the Sacred Scriptures from the time of their origin to the present day, prominence being given to the struggle of the English Reformers for its translation into the English language.

The numerous engravings were executed by the best artists of this country and of England and France. They will assist in interesting children in the text, and will aid in the instruction of those too young to read.

Address, REVIEW AND HERALD,
Battle Creek, Mich.